

Y3 – Your Purposes & Values

Dear: As I already mentioned, my original goal for these Y-chapters (before I learned about your parents' plans to divorce) was to try to “tie up a few loose ends”. I was trying to do so in the context of my mantra (from **P**)

The priorities are, first, premisses; then, purposes – and then, principles, priorities, and policies – and finally, plans, procedures, and practices (with perseverance).

In the previous chapter, the “loose end” that I was trying to tie up was to urge you to be especially careful when adopting premisses about the nature of this universe and how to gain information about it, because those two fundamental premisses are the foundation for your worldview. Consistent with your worldview, you then choose your purposes (or goals), against which, in turn, you measure your values. For this chapter, my goals are to try to “tie up a few loose ends” dealing with your chosen purposes and associated values.

Yet, to try to “tie it all up in a single package”, I again urge you to be especially careful choosing your premisses. I assume that, as with most people, you have little difficulty in deciding that you exist, that your ideas exist (at least, as a minimum, as electrochemical signals in your brain), and that the universe exists. Although I know of no way to “prove” that such premisses are “true”, many ways are potentially available to try to demonstrate that they're false; yet, not once have I found that my similar ideas are false. Consequently, I'll continue to treat them as (extremely!) useful working hypotheses.

I've also adopted the premisses that the universe is natural and that information about it can be gained *via* the scientific method. The same two premisses (or “useful working hypotheses”) have been adopted by ~10 to 20% of all humans now alive. If such people choose to describe themselves with labels (although commonly they prefer to avoid labels), they might call themselves “scientists” or “Humanists” or “scientific humanists” or (more recently) “Brights” (meaning those who hold a naturalistic worldview).

The other ~80 to 90% of the people in the world have adopted the premiss that the universe contains various “supernatural entities”, usually including various gods, ghosts, and goblins. In addition, they adopt the premiss that information about such supernatural entities can be gained by such activities

as “listening to one’s heart”, “studying the scriptures”, “revelations from the prophets”, or similar (including dreaming, hallucinating, and various other “ecstasies”, “epiphanies”, and other “mystical experiences”, including taking hallucinogens). Such people commonly label Brights as “atheists”, or (principally by Christians) as “infidels”, or (by religious Jews) as “epicureans”, or (by Muslims) as “unbelievers”, or (in the case of religious kooks in “modern” America, such as Pat Robertson and President Bush, Sr.) as “un-American”.

Meanwhile, essentially all Brights are convinced by data that the premisses adopted by “religious people” (~80 to 90% of the people of the world!) not only yield useless hypotheses but even that such speculations are somewhere between crazy and criminal. In fact, as I’ve already addressed (especially in the **X** chapters), vast quantities of reliable data are available (dealing with oppression of women, associated overpopulation and poverty, clerical excesses and extravagances, violence and war, etc.) to support the conclusion that no idea has caused humanity so much trouble as the untestable hypotheses that any god exists or has ever existed, and the testable but failed hypotheses that people can communicate or have ever communicated with such nonexistent “beings”.

In turn, troubles (which such ideas cause) are associated with the purposes that religious people adopt, consistent with their worldview. In general, people’s purposes can either be “pulled out of thin air” or derived from principles established *via* the scientific method. Yet, in either case (and as I’ve tried to show you in this book), substantial data suggest that all people (regardless of their worldviews) adopt as their prime goal a trio of survival goals: of themselves, their families (whatever extent they recognize for their families), and their values (whatever objectives they choose against which to measure their values). As I’ve also tried to show you, differences among people arise from their choices of goals against which their values are measured: whether their objectives are based on data (e.g., to promote their dual survival goals of themselves and their families) or “pulled out of thin air” (or from any, similarly tenuous, “holy” book).

My conclusion that all people pursue their trio of survival goals may seem incongruous with your experiences, but I hope you see that it’s not. I continue to maintain (based on a huge amount of data) that all sane humans pursue their trio of survival goals (survival – or even the “thrival” – of themselves, their “families”, and their “values”). I included the adjective

‘sane’, because in my opinion, people who don’t desire to live are (by my definition) not sane; I put the word ‘families’ in quotations, because (again) people differ in what they consider to be the extent of their “extended family” (some people consider all life to be a part of “the family of life”); I put the word ‘values’ in quotations because different people adopt different values, because they recognize different sources of their values.

I also maintain that we all pursue our dual survival goals (of ourselves and our families), regardless of our worldviews (e.g., natural or supernatural). What differs with our worldviews, however, is how we choose our values. Brights (or naturalists or scientific humanists) base most of their values on their dual survival goals (which can include placing value on all life forms, depending on the recognized extent of their extended families); supernaturalists, on the other hand, adopt as their values those promoted by their clerics, who claim to represent “the supernatural”.

But, Dear, people who choose “serving their god” as their prime goal are simultaneous choosing as their prime goal the same trio of survival goals – the main difference is that most religious people choose to adopt the premiss (an untested and untestable speculation) that they possess “immortal souls” and can live forever. Nonetheless, no doubt such theists consider themselves “rational”: “If our god wants us to push young girls into the volcano, then obviously we ‘should’, obviously it’s ‘right’, and obviously we’d be ‘immoral’ if we didn’t.” The difference, however, is that such religious people have made horrible errors, not only in their reasoning but also (and more significantly) by not testing their reasoned results experimentally. Spinoza would have called such mistakes “confused thought”; scientific humanists who are unconstrained by political correctness describe such people as “brainwashed”, “shallow thinkers”, or “just plain dumb”.

But even if you were to agree with me that all sane people pursue their trio of survival goals as their “prime purpose”, even if you are willing to overlook the apparent silliness of suggesting that a single “prime purpose” can encompass more than one goal (because people’s goals change in changed circumstances), and even if you acknowledge that different people adopt different concepts of family and values, yet I trust you see that, because values have meaning only relative to some objective (or purpose), then people can (and do) behave dramatically differently, depending on differences in their choice about how to gain knowledge – and their subsequent worldviews, assumed purposes, and therefore different values.

For example, reaching the conclusion that “[Reverence for life affords me my fundamental principle of morality](#),” Albert Schweitzer returned to university to obtain his medical degree, so he could improve the health of a “tribe” he had “adopted” in Africa. In contrast, reaching the conclusion that Muhammad was a spokesman for Allah, still another Islamic extremist ties a belt of explosives around his or her waist to murder still another group of “unbelievers” and, of more significance to him or her, to proceed directly to “paradise”. Both Schweitzer and the terrorists pursued their trio of survival goals, but what astoundingly different sets of values they adopted!

Again, the cause of such dramatic differences in values can be found in differences in assumptions about how knowledge is gained (e.g., via “belief” or *via* the scientific method), about subsequent worldviews, and differences in objectives. A devout Muslim (or Christian or Mormon) adopts a supernatural worldview, and consistent with that view, “believes” in “eternal survival” – provided that the clerics’ rules are obeyed. It’s then totally consistent with the supernaturalists’ worldview that they blow themselves up for the *Jihad* (or stick their heads in the lions mouths or whatever) in pursuit of their dual survival goals (when in those dual survival goals are included the assumed important goal of “eternal survival”). In a scientific humanist’s “naturalistic worldview”, in contrast, nothing could be dumber than to kill oneself to live forever!

In the past, Christians “thought” that they would go straight to heaven if they died while killing Muslims during the Crusades, that it was “moral” to torture and burn people who thought otherwise, and that it was “right” to slit the throats of children who made the sign of the cross the “wrong” way. And even today, there are “faithful” Muslims who stupidly conclude that they’ll go straight to “Paradise” if they tie explosives around their waists and blow themselves up for the *Jihad* (i.e., whatever their clerics define to be a “holy war”, threatening the clerics’ grasp on power). Such people pursue the same survival goals, of themselves (even for eternity!), of their genes, and of their values, but apparently they’re too dumb or too poorly educated to realize the enormous errors in their logic, their enormous error in not testing their hypotheses before adopting them, and the enormous error in accepting objectives dictated by con-artist clerics.

You can then see what enormous problems can arise when people adopt crazy, supernatural worldviews – and associated goals and values. All the

supernatural jabberwocky, from all the different religions of the world, has confused simple-minded people into “believing” that various ridiculous gods defined the objectives for humans (and thereby, defined values such as morality). One result has been absolutely horrible brutalities, stretching throughout history and continuing essentially unabated today, promoted by supernatural junkies who hoist their “holy-cause” banners.

If all confused thoughts about purposes could be eliminated, then I’m confident that humanity could make huge progress toward solving our over-population and over-consumption problems, toward developing harmonious views of worldwide social justice and reduction in physical violence. And the “damnedest thing” is that getting there from here means going down just a relatively simple little hill – on a simple path marked “common sense” – to adopt the obvious premisses that the universe is natural and that information about it can be determined *via* the scientific method: “**guess, test, and reassess**”, “**to try to make sure you’re not fooling yourself.**” Then, with purposes clear, people have standards against which to establish their values.

To illustrate, I’ll recount one of my experiences with you. We were visiting you when you were eleven (I think – sorry about that, but you keep changing your age!). With your mother standing beside you in the kitchen, you and she were proudly showing me your new necklace. It seems that you received it as an award for some “accomplishment” in your church; therefore, my mind immediately became unreceptive. I didn’t want to know details. To you I said something similar to: “**It’s very nice.**” To your mother I said something similar to: “**I bet you’re very proud.**” And to myself I said something similar to: “**Feet, try to move; legs, try to get me out of here; mouth, try not to say any more!**”

I’m not sure of the details that led to your receiving that necklace – your being harnessed with that yoke around your neck – which filled you and your mother with such pride. But I had the strong suspicion that your “accomplishment” was to memorize the “Articles of Faith” of your church, which I had recently been reading. I sought no additional information, said no more, and quickly left – because my mind was filled with rage, contempt, disgust... that my beautiful and brilliant grandchild was being polluted with such garbage – such ignorance!

THE MORMON'S "ARTICLES OF FAITH IGNORANCE"

Below, I'll quote the Mormon's "Articles of Faith", copied from the official website of the LDS Church. As you know, the claim is made that Joseph Smith wrote these Articles of Faith. In what follows, I'll add some notes [in brackets, such as these], as if I'm responding to Smith.

The Articles of Faith of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

1. We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in His Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost. [Really? You "believe"? Based on what: speculations by savages?]
2. We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgression. ["Sins"? What "sins"? People make mistakes; they don't "sin". "Sins" are concocted by clerics to fill their collection plates! And "punished" – by whom: a supernatural boogeyman in the sky?!]
3. We believe that through the Atonement of Christ, all mankind may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel. [The "Atonement of Christ"? He died so that people's "sins" could be "atoned"? The allegedly innocent Jesus was punished to "atone" for the "sins" of the guilty? What sort of convoluted justice is that? Punish the innocent to "atone" for the "sins" of the guilty! That's what Hitler's henchmen did: they shot innocent people in the hometowns of the "resistance fighters". That's your idea of justice?! And "saved"? "Saved" from what? Death? Eternal damnation? What data support such suppositions? Certainly the people aren't "saved" from another bunch of con-artist clerics! And "obedience"? To whom? To the same con artists – or to Hitler?]
4. We believe that the first principles and ordinances of the Gospel are: first, Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, Repentance; third, Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; fourth, Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. ["Faith"? What are the reasons for such "faith"? "Repentance"? For what: sins or mistakes? "Baptism... for the remission of sins"? Gimme a break: it takes more than water to make amends for mistakes! "Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost"? You "think" ghosts exist? Surely somebody's kidding!]
5. We believe that a man must be called of God, by prophecy, and by the laying on of hands by those who are in authority, to preach the Gospel and administer in the ordinances thereof. [If a group of con artists are to keep their con game going, they gotta have a chain of command! Hail to those in "authority"!]
6. We believe in the same organization that existed in the Primitive Church, namely, apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, and so forth. [There's no hierarchy like a religious hierarchy!]

7. We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, and so forth. [Surely somebody's conning someone! Would it really be desirable if such "gifts" were really available?!]
8. We believe the Bible to be the word of God as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the Book of Mormon to be the word of God. ["The word of God"!! Hasn't anyone told you crazy clerics that God doesn't use words, communicating only in mathematical symbols? I mean, obviously God wrote

$$\nabla \cdot \vec{D} = \rho \quad (\text{Coulomb's "Law"})$$

$$\nabla \cdot \vec{B} = 0 \quad (\text{No magnetic monopoles})$$

$$\nabla \times \vec{E} = -\dot{\vec{B}} \quad (\text{Hertz's + Lenz's "Law"})$$

$$\nabla \times \vec{H} = \vec{j} + \dot{\vec{D}} \quad (\text{Ampere's "Law" + Maxwell's Modification})$$

$$\vec{B} = \mu \vec{H}; \vec{D} = \epsilon \vec{E}; (\mu \epsilon)^{-1} = c^2$$

and there was light!]

9. We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and we believe that He will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the Kingdom of God. ["Reveals" it? Maybe so – but only to Galileo, Newton, Darwin, Maxwell, Boltzmann, Einstein, and similar brilliant people. The "Kingdom of God"? What craziness is this? God runs a "kingship"? A dictatorship? Similar to a religious hierarchy? Wouldn't it be preferable to live in a representative democracy?]
10. We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes; that Zion (the New Jerusalem) will be built upon the American continent; that Christ will reign personally upon the earth; and, that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisiacal glory. [I hate to burst your bubble, but the genes of the Ten Tribes of Israel melted into the gene pool, Christ "lives on" only in the minds of myopic dreamers, and there's a whole lot of people who no longer want to live under a ruler who "reigns". We prefer to elect our "law makers" – and throw the bums out when they don't measure up.]
11. We claim the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where, or what they may. [You "allow" all men to worship their ignorance? How amazingly generous of you. But if you don't mind, I'll rely on enforcement of the Bill of Rights of our Constitution – and I prefer to try to eliminate my ignorance.]
12. We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers, and magistrates, in obeying, honoring, and sustaining the law. ["Obeying, honoring, and sustaining..." the laws of segregation, for example? What if the laws are immoral?]

13. We believe in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to all men; indeed, we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul – We believe all things, we hope all things, we have endured many things, and hope to be able to endure all things. If there is anything virtuous, lovely, or of good report or praiseworthy, we seek after these things. [“We believe in being honest...”? With yourselves? Then how could you “believe” all the garbage in these “Articles of Faith” without evaluating the statements? If you hoodwink yourself into “believing” junk that isn’t supported by a shred of data, then what does “true” mean to you? “You believe all things?” Really? You “believe” that the Moon is made of Swiss cheese? You “seek after” what is “of good report or praiseworthy”? Really? You “seek after” knowledge? You seek to eliminate your ignorance? Then may I suggest that you abandon all your crazy ideas about God? Or do you predominantly spend your time playing “make believe”?]

Sorry, Dear. As you can see, I quickly “lose my cool” when confronted by such ignorance. Certainly, though, I’m not alone and not the first person who has concluded that such ignorance yields substantial evil. For example, in his 2007 book, *god is not great – How Religion Poisons Everything*, Christopher Hitchens quotes what John Stuart Mill wrote about his father:

His aversion to religion, in the sense usually attached to the term, was of the same kind with that of Lucretius: he regarded it with the feelings due, not to a mere mental delusion, but to a great moral evil. He looked upon it as the greatest enemy of morality: first, by setting up factitious excellencies – belief in creeds, devotional feelings, and ceremonies, not connected with the good of human kind – and causing these to be accepted as substitutes for genuine virtue; but above all, by radically vitiating the standard of morals; making it consist in doing the will of a being, on whom it lavished indeed all the phrases of adulation, but whom in sober truth it depicts as eminently hateful.

And to think that my poor grandchildren – along with billions of other children in the world – are given the option either to adopt such (or similar) stupidity or lose their parents’ love! Cry for the world’s children.

SOME HUMANIST “ARTICLES OF FAITH IDEAS”

In contrast to the ignorance – the evil – in the above “Articles of Faith” that you were forced to memorize, consider the following humanist “Articles of Faith” (or better, “Articles of Ideas”, or maybe better “Statement of Values”) that an old grandfather will now bang out on this keyboard almost as fast as he can type (i.e., I haven’t given the following any forethought).

1. We believe – better, “we conclude” – that the word ‘belief’ is used poorly. We recommend that people either 1) state that they “wish [such-and-such] were so” (e.g., “I wish it weren’t raining” or “I wish that God existed”) or 2) state that they “estimate the probability that [such-and-such] is true to be [whatever]” (e.g., I estimate that the probability that God exists is very much less than 1 chance in 10^{200}). That is, instead of stating some “belief”, let’s either state what we hope to be or give our best estimate of what actually is – based on evidence, based on succinctly summarizing reliable data in testable hypotheses, and based on hypotheses whose predictions have passed rigorous tests, i.e., in short, based on the scientific method.
2. We conclude, based on an absolutely staggering number of reliable tests, that confidence in the scientific method (also known as “common sense”) is amply justified: it’s the best way known to gain knowledge about the reality external to our minds.
3. We conclude that, for any person, a hypothesis that succinctly summarizes a substantial quantity of reproducible data and that provides predictions whose reliability has been repeatedly tested and found to be accurate (and therefore, a hypothesis in which trust is justified) is: “I exist.” Extending this result, another hypothesis that seems to provide reliable predictions is that there are many other things in this universe that exist and are distinct. These hypotheses, that some things exist and are distinct (i.e., $A \equiv A$ and $A \neq \neg A$), form the basis of logic and mathematics.
4. We conclude that, in our minds, ideas “exist” as electrochemical signals or patterns in our brains, but experimental tests are required to determine if our ideas correspond to anything or any process in the universe external to our brains.
5. We conclude that no tests have ever revealed that any gods, ghosts, immortal souls, invisible pink flying elephants, and similar, exist as anything but ideas in people’s brains.
6. We conclude that all available evidence suggests that, when we die, although our ideas may continue to exist in other people’s minds, the compounds and elements of which we are made are “recycled”, eventually to be used in other natural processes.
7. We conclude that, while alive, we humans pursue a trio of prime “survival goals”: to continue to live (survival of ourselves), to help our genetic code continue (survival of our extended families), and to promote, practice, and protect our values (survival of our values).
8. We conclude that our dual survival goals (of ourselves and our extended families) appear to be programmed in our genes, dictated by our DNA molecules (the fundamental units of life, which found a way not only to replicate themselves but also to protect themselves in their own environments).

9. We conclude that most human values (excepting those values dealing with aesthetics) are derived both from our dual survival goals and from our childhood indoctrinations, including from our communities. Most adults willingly remain affiliated with communities, to promote their dual survival goals (because individual humans are quite vulnerable to many aspects of nature's vagaries – including other groups of unfriendly humans). The values inculcated in us by our communities (in morals, customs, laws, etc.) are generally “designed” (by experience) to promote the community's well being, and therefore, generally, promote the well being of individual members of the community. Unfortunately, however, exceptions are common – as any slave, maltreated woman, maligned minority, etc. would attest, if there were no punishments for doing so.
10. We conclude that, in the past in most of the world and still today in much of the world, indoctrination of “community values” was unfortunately controlled by clerics who held and still hold primitive, prehistoric, silly views of the universe and our place within it. Broadly speaking, their views are that some “supernatural superman in the sky” made the universe, continues to watch over it and to spy on people, and “his” values are those relayed to the people by the clerics – i.e., those with the collection plates. We conclude, in sum, that the clerics of the world are running massive con games, carried on by clerics who are either too ignorant to realize their ignorance or too conniving to relinquish their control over their collection plates.
11. We expect that, in the future, the silly “science” promoted by the clerics in their con games will be widely exposed (and probably outlawed) and that humans will adopt values that the scientific method demonstrates will promote our dual survival goals (of individuals and each individual's extended family, out to and including all life forms, and therefore, including our environment). In time, the prime goal may be universally adopted: to help intelligence life continue.
12. In summary, we conclude that in this admittedly tiny part of the universe, nature has found a way to become aware of herself, by creating humans. In our admittedly biased viewpoint, it would seem to be a pity if this awareness didn't continue. We therefore resolve to try to help human intelligence go on and to expand. Consistently, we resolve to counteract and try to contract human ignorance – such as all the ignorance about gods, ghosts, immortal souls, and similar “supernatural” nonsense, and such as all the ludicrous “Articles of Faiths”, “Statements of Belief” and similar blights on human intelligence promoted by the damnable clerics of the world.

Now, Dear, if you were to adopt something similar to the above “Articles of Ideas” or “Statement of Values” (instead of the LDS “Articles of Faith” that you were forced to memorize for fear of losing your mother's love), then I don't promise to give you a necklace, but I do promise that, in fairly short order, you'd get over the guilt of lying to yourself.

I further promise that you'll feel even better about yourself if you'd create your own "Statement of Values"! As for what values that you'd chose to adopt – using your brain as best you can (i.e., being as moral as you can be) – that, of course, is entirely up to you. In earlier chapters, I've tried to show you the values that I've adopted (e.g., "Evaluate!", "Everyone has an equal right to claim one's own existence", etc.), and I don't want to go through them again. Therefore, in the following, I'll show you some sets of values that other Humanists have adopted.

SOME VALUES ADOPTED BY OTHER HUMANISTS

I've copied the first set of values, "The Ten Commandments (of the Ethical Atheist)", from the webpage of the Ethical Atheist.¹ I hope you'll consider them carefully – and consider adopting some of them for yourself. I've added a couple of notes in brackets and eliminated the internal references.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS (OF THE ETHICAL ATHEIST)

NOTE: Freethought and tolerance obviously prohibit these from being "commandments"! Just consider them "suggestions".

1. Thou SHALT NOT believe all thou art told.
2. Thou SHALT seek knowledge and truth constantly.
3. Thou SHALT educate thy fellow man in the Laws [Principles] of Science.
4. Thou SHALT NOT forget the atrocities committed in the name of god.
5. Thou SHALT leave valuable contributions for future generations.
6. Thou SHALT live in peace with thy fellow man.
7. Thou SHALT live this one life thou hast to its fullest.
8. Thou SHALT follow a Personal Code of Ethics.
9. Thou SHALT maintain a strict separation between Church and State.
10. Thou SHALT support those who follow these commandments.

DISCUSSION ON THE TEN COMMANDMENTS (of the Ethical Atheist):

1. Thou SHALT NOT believe all thou art told.

Humans are generally very gullible. We believe [all] sorts of false statements, stories, reasoning, etc. We even continue to believe falsehoods after they have been proven untrue [or better, whose validity has been shown to be extremely doubtful]. History is full of amazing hoaxes often supported by religion and the teachings of the Church... or by others seeking power, popularity, or fortune. We have been told the Earth was flat and has four corners [and that], if not careful, we may fall off. We

¹ At <http://www.ethicalatheist.com/index.html>.

have been told that the Earth is the center of the Universe. We have been told that sky is a fixed, firm structure to which the sun, moon and stars are affixed. We have been told that personalities and future events are predictable using astrology, card reading, crystal balls, and palm reading. We have been told of prophecies by Nostradamus. We have been told of speaking with the dead, the dead rising, life after death, reincarnation and bending spoons, to name only a few. We must be more skeptical [of] what we are told, what we read, and what we are exposed to through the various forms of broadcast media. When exposed to something new, do NOT accept what you hear without facts to support it. There are other agendas at work in your deception. You must always be on guard to protect yourself and your knowledge.

2. Thou SHALT seek knowledge and truth constantly.

There are many adverse factors making it difficult for us to obtain knowledge and [approach] the truth. There is often no motivating factor driving others to present you with fair, factual, scientific truths. By weaving a complex web of lies, religions are able to control people and remain in power. Governments may hide facts and events for fear of scaring the public. There are more advertising dollars and higher ratings in broadcasting claims of communicating with the dead than [about] Kepler's Laws of Planetary Motion. Therefore, we must take an active role in our own education and constantly seek the truth. It isn't always obvious and is often very difficult to obtain. Thou SHALT make time to read non-fiction. Thou SHALT make time to view educational programs. Thou SHALT spend as much time in the library as you do in the mall or watching television.

3. Thou SHALT educate thy fellow man in the [Principles] of Science.

People are generally lazy and hold onto currently held false beliefs. This condition is not acceptable to the ethical atheist. It is not good enough to sit comfortably with your knowledge of the Universe and look in pity at those who are still governed by lies, mythology, and sensationalism... Only by increasing the comprehension of scientific [principles] can we hope to continue our progress past the Dark Ages. Only if the world contains more educated people can we hope to not have setbacks. Thou SHALT NOT sit silent and be a closet atheist. Thou SHALT enlighten thy neighbor.

4. Thou SHALT NOT forget the atrocities committed in the name of god.

Many people have limited knowledge, or none at all, of the atrocities committed during the Inquisition, the Crusades, etc. by the Church and in the name of religion. Christians are not unique in their cruelty. For example, Muslim civilizations often imprison, torture, or kill those attempting to convert their citizens to Christianity... Few are even remotely aware of these atrocities or think, "Oh, that was a long time ago and could never happen again". However, it hasn't been that long ago and is still occurring today in countries like Bosnia, Rwanda, Burundi, Somalia, Israel, Tibet and Afghanistan. Thou SHALT fear a repeat of history.

5. Thou SHALT leave valuable contributions for future generations.

The nature of knowledge-gain is that new [principles] are most often found by building upon known facts. If every generation were required to start fresh in its

quest for knowledge, our progress would be severely impacted. Our children will not have to go back and prove that the earth is not flat. They will not have to rediscover the atom. It is important that our generation, and all those that follow, leave scientific knowledge and resources for our offspring to build upon. Write a book. Publish an article. Develop a web site. Leave money to organizations that further science and education.

6. Thou SHALT live in peace with thy fellow man.

This should not need stating, but murders, torture, wars, and brutality are ever present in all civilizations on earth and have been for all of recorded history. Most of the large-scale wars, as well as suicide bombers, are driven by religious beliefs and the belief in an afterlife. Even though many religions claim to be against killing, they promote that killing for god is divine and will ensure a special status in the afterlife. If we didn't have these widespread mythological beliefs, there would likely be a massive decrease in the killings.

7. Thou SHALT live this one life thou hast to its fullest.

We do not believe in an afterlife nor that we will be reincarnated to live again in another form. It is, therefore, imperative that we live this one life we have to its fullest. We should not live in a puritanical way, starving ourselves of pleasures, in hopes that it somehow makes us better or that we will be judged more favorably in our "next life". However, in living our lives to the fullest, we must always be conscious of our actions to ensure that they do not have adverse effects on our fellow man.

8. Thou SHALT follow a Personal Code of Ethics.

Everyone should have their own personal code of ethics that drives their behavior. What this contains is an individual undertaking, but current laws are a good starting point. Many of the commandments of the Bible can be summarized by this commandment. For example, it should be self-evident that murder, lying, and stealing should be avoided and honoring your mother and father are necessary, assuming of course that they are worthy of this respect (e.g., they are not beating/raping you or otherwise abusing you). In general, a personal code of ethics would not cause harm to others, would be anchored in truth, and would strive to make society a better place.

9. Thou SHALT maintain a strict separation between Church and State.

It is extremely dangerous to mix the mind-controlling, fear-generating, mythological beliefs of religion with the governing aspects and power of the state. History is full of examples. Many who founded the United States knew this and were willing to die to escape the horrors of Europe. We know that freedom can be measured by the separation of church and state.

10. Thou SHALT support those who follow these commandments.

Get involved! Our progress in the last 250 years has been hard fought. Do not sit idle and let us suffer setbacks. Religious conservatives are highly organized and well

funded. They continue to spread lies. They are trying to rid our schools of teaching evolution. They are infiltrating government. They are targeting our children's young, impressionable minds. We must support those who follow these commandments in every way possible. Support scientific and atheist organizations by submitting writings, donating money, etc. (donations are often tax deductible). Purchase books and subscribe to magazines. Attend seminars. All of these provide backing and support to continue valuable efforts. Worthy organizations include (but are not limited to): Americans United for Separation of Church and State, American Atheists, CSICOP – The Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal and the Skeptical Inquirer Magazine, The Skeptic's Annotated Bible, The Center for Inquiry, EvolveFish, Online Library of Literature, your local library, etc...

Another proposed set of the Ten Commandments
 From reader AL BLAZO (rants@wackedup.com)
 Submitted January 2, 2004

No one of sound mind would dare claim that the world we live in today is a better place because of the Ten Commandments. The Ten Commandments have been with us for more than two millennia yet murder, cruelty, thievery, racism, ethnic hatred, and religious strife [are] just as much, if not more, a part of our everyday lives as [they] ever [were].

I believe that it's about time to scrap the Ten Commandments as we know them and replace them with a new set of "rules" that may actually be useful to us. Towards this end I have compiled a new set of commandments that hopefully will have some value to mankind...

- I. Thou shalt worship only reason [better, the scientific method!]
- II. Thou shalt abstain from invoking deities in the affairs of man
- III. Thou shalt disdain all ritual [better, ritualized "knowledge"]
- IV. Thou shalt abhor priestliness [better, all clerics]
- V. Thou shalt loathe superstition
- VI. Thou shalt reject all forms of spiritualism and supernaturalism
- VI. Thou shalt regard skepticism as a virtue
- VIII. Thou shalt reject racism
- IX. Thou shalt reject all claims to a moral authority greater than man
- X. Thou shalt, in word and action, strive to improve the human condition.

For another example, Dear, I hope you'll consider the following (long!) article by Raymond Bradley; it's based on his 2002 presentation to the New Zealand Association of Rationalists and Humanists. The footnotes associated with this essay are Bradley's (although I've changed the numbering of the footnotes to conform to footnote numbers in this chapter).

As you can find from Bradley's website,² he has had a long, productive life: he's even older than I am (how's that for "hard to believe"!), he was a university professor (and chair) of philosophy, and similar to you, as a child he was steeped in religious fundamentalism. It's my opinion that you'd be wise to consider the wisdom in the following article:³ he's "been there, done that" – and he's been kind enough to show you what he's learned.

THE MEANING OF LIFE
REFLECTIONS ON GOD, IMMORTALITY, AND FREE WILL
Raymond D. Bradley

Three metaphysical questions.

Philosophers, and other thinking people, have long pondered three grand questions about the nature of reality and our status and significance within it.

First: Does reality include a supernatural realm, inhabited by spiritual beings such as gods? Or is the familiar natural world all there is to it?

Second: If there is indeed a supernatural world, how do we relate to it? Are we composite creatures with a foot in both camps, so to speak; creatures with souls as well as bodies? If the latter, is it possible that our souls should live on after our bodies are no more? Or is physical death the end for all of us?

Third: What is the nature of the free will that we commonly suppose ourselves to enjoy during our sojourn here on earth? Do we in fact have free will? Or are our lives little more than pointless scribbles on the fabric of the universe, as devoid of real significance as scratches on a piece of glaciated rock?

Their pertinence to the meaning of life.

Each of these questions is apt to come up in any discussion of the more general one: "What is the meaning of life, if indeed life does have a meaning?" So I'll say a little about each.

A: GOD AND THE MEANING OF LIFE.

How, for a start, might the existence of a god or gods affect the meaningfulness of our lives here on earth?

Among the plausible answers that might be given are these:

² At <http://www.sfu.ca/philosophy/bradley/bradley.htm>.

³ Copied from <http://www.sfu.ca/philosophy/bradley/The%20Meaning%20of%20Life.pdf>.

- That if there is deity to whose existence – as is often supposed – we owe both our own existence and that of the physical universe, then surely we should live our lives in accordance with any plans that deity might have for us;
- That it is therefore incumbent on us to find out what those intentions are; and
- That our lives will be most meaningful if we fulfill that deity's purposes.

In short, some would say that the real meaning of life is to be found in service to such a god, and in living according to his or her dictates.

But which god are we talking about? And which of his or her commands are we to obey?

Which god?

First: To whom does the term “god” refer?

Obviously not to some New Age god or other construct of man's imagination. Few would suppose that such gods communicate with us at all, let alone about how we should live.

And obviously not to the Aztec god, Huitzilopochtli, who – only about 600 years ago – supposedly commanded the sacrifice of 50,000 youths and maidens in a single year. Nor to his brother, Tezcatlipoca, who supposedly consumed 25,000 virgins annually. Nor, presumably, to any of the other 189 gods whose “death” was celebrated by H. L. Mencken in his 1922 essay “Memorial Service”.⁴ There is no good evidence for their existence. And no enlightened person could countenance the idea that their commands were moral. These gods deserve the oblivion to which thinking men and women have consigned them.

But, by the same token, so does the God of our much vaunted Judeo-Christian tradition. After all, this is the God who, according to the Old Testament, is said to have drowned every member of the human race, not just wicked men and women, but innocent children, suckling infants, and the unborn, with the sole exceptions of the drunkard, Noah, and his incestuous family.⁵

This is the God who himself slaughters hundreds of thousands, if not millions, by means of his angels, serpents, hailstones, windstorm, earthquake, fire, and plague.⁶ This is a God who: gives 32,000 Midianite virgins to the soldiers who had killed

⁴ H. L. Mencken, *Memorial Service*, copyright 1922 by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., and renewed 1950 by H. L. Mencken.

⁵ Genesis 7: 23.

⁶ For instance, he punished King David for carrying out a census that he himself had ordered and then complied with David's request that others be punished instead of him by sending a plague to kill 70,000 people. [*II Samuel 24*: 1-15]

their families;⁷ who allows his hero, Jephthah, to demonstrate his devotion by sacrificing his daughter “as a burnt offering”;⁸ who punishes the Babylonians by having “their little ones . . . dashed to pieces before their eyes . . . and their wives ravished”;⁹ who declares “I will cause them [members of his own chosen people] to eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters, and they shall eat everyone the flesh of his friend”;¹⁰ and who commands His chosen people to slay “both man and woman, infant and suckling” in 31 kingdoms while directing the Israelites in their policy of ethnic cleansing of the land that orthodox Jews now call Greater Israel.¹¹ And this is the very same God¹² who, in the New Testament, repeatedly promises eternal torment in the fires of Hell¹³ for all those – the majority of the human race – who haven’t believed in Jesus (an obscure figure whose dates of birth and death no-one knows and whose historical status may fairly be likened to that of Hercules, Mithra, King Arthur, or William Tell).¹⁴

The God of the Judaism, Christianity, and Islam – as supposedly revealed in the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Koran – is depicted as a spiritual being who commits, causes, commands, or condones violations of almost all the moral precepts that we hold dear. He is a moral monster, infinitely more evil than the moral monsters of human history: the Genghis Khans, Hitlers, Stalins, Pol Pots from whom we shrink in horror. And the world he supposedly created for us to live in is one in which we – and his other creatures – are constantly being assailed by his chosen weapons of mass destruction: natural disasters such as tsunamis that kill hundreds of thousands, not just the 3,000 odd of September 11, 2001; radiological bombardments from outer space; chemical and biological minefields that await our blundering missteps because he has not deigned to reveal them to us; and diseases such as cancer, filariasis, hookworm, malaria, and schistosoma that cripple or kill countless millions each year.¹⁵

⁷ *Numbers 31*: 17-18.

⁸ *Judges 11*: 34-39.

⁹ *Isaiah 13*: 16.

¹⁰ *Jeremiah 19*: 9. For other instances in which God causes, commands, or concurs with cannibalism see *Leviticus 26*: 29, *Deuteronomy 28*: 53-58, *Ezekiel 5*: 10.

¹¹ *I Samuel 15*: 3 and *Joshua 10*. And by way of explanation of why only one of the indigenous peoples made peace with the invaders, we are told, “For it was of the Lord to harden their hearts, to meet Israel in battle that he might utterly destroy them, that they might receive no mercy . . .” [*Joshua 11*: 20]. The occasion for killing was contrived by God himself.

¹² To suppose that the New Testament God is different from the God of the Old Testament is to dissent from Jesus’ reported view of the matter: it is to be guilty of the Marcionite heresy.

¹³ The book of Revelation tells us that “everyone whose name has not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb who has been slain” [*Revelation 13*: 8] will go to Hell where they “will be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment goes up forever and ever: and they have no rest day or night.” [*Revelation 14*: 10-11]

¹⁴ As is acknowledged by many liberal biblical scholars including the less conservative members of the Jesus Seminar.

¹⁵ Reflecting on his own list of God-generated disasters and diseases, Mark Twain [in *Letters from the Earth*, posthumously published in 1938] commented:

Compared to Him, the Aztec gods were paragons of virtue. So, too, is Satan – the mythical personification of evil – who is portrayed as being guilty of nothing much worse than tempting Eve with a piece of fruit or, with God’s permission, giving Job a bad case of boils.

Is this the God on whose behavior we ought to model our own in order to give a meaning to our lives? If so, we have a moral license for mayhem.

Or are we to say that what is good enough for God is not good enough for us?

Which commands?

Second: If it were the Judeo-Christian-Islamic God in obedience to whom we are to find life’s meaning, which of his commands should we obey? All of them? Or just those that now satisfy our moral scruples?

One problem is that this God prescribes the death penalty for over thirty offenses. These include: being a stubborn and rebellious son; cursing or hitting one’s parents; owning an ox that happens to kill a man; blaspheming; committing adultery; committing homosexual acts; picking up sticks or working on the Sabbath; preaching other religions; and so on. If we were to obey this God’s dictates, we would have a quick solution to the world’s population problem. Are we really obliged to kill all who are guilty of these offenses? Or is it up to us to decide which laws to obey?

Clearly, there are grave difficulties with the belief that the meaning of life is to be found in service to any revealed god: the Yahweh of Judaism, the God of Christianity, or the Allah of Islam.

It is curious – the way the human mind works. The Christian begins with this straight proposition...: God is all-knowing, and all-powerful.

This being the case, nothing can happen without his knowing beforehand that it is going to happen; nothing happens without his permission; nothing can happen that he chooses to prevent.

That is definite enough, isn’t it? It makes the Creator distinctly responsible for everything that happens, doesn’t it?...

[Man] equips the Creator with every trait that goes to the making of a fiend, and then arrives at the conclusion that a fiend and a father are the same thing!... What do you think of the human mind? I mean, in case you think there is a human mind.

Do any gods exist?

There are grave difficulties, for that matter, in the supposition that any sort of god exists. If a god exists who does not reveal himself, then we have no clear evidence for the existence of that god. At best we can produce abstract philosophical arguments for the existence of some sort of vaguely conceived deity, or supreme being.

But such arguments – the arguments of so-called natural theology (as opposed to revealed theology) – are notoriously feeble. The argument from design, when viewed in the light of the disasters and diseases in the universe such a deity supposedly designed, leads to the conclusion that the Great Watchmaker is either incompetent or malevolent. And it raises the further question, “Who designed God?” Likewise, the argument from the alleged need for a cause of existence gets us nowhere. If we postulate an existing God as an answer to the question “Why does anything exist?” we merely add to the list of existing entities. That only adds to the burden of explanation by raising the question “What caused God?” We do better to avoid the regress by accepting the existence of the universe as a brute fact.

There are no sound reasons, I would argue, for supposing that there are any gods at all, either revealed or hidden from view. *A fortiori*, there is no good reason for believing that we should order our lives so as to take account of their alleged existence and purposes for us.

B : SURVIVAL AND THE MEANING OF LIFE.

How about the supposition that the meaning of this life lies in one that is to follow?

This widespread belief is implicit in the view that if all came to an end at the grave, then life itself would be devoid of meaning.

Now it is clear that the question whether we are composite creatures having spirits or souls that might survive our bodily deaths is independent of the question whether other spiritual beings such as gods, angels, or devils, exist. As for the latter, we may well believe – and, for the reasons just given, also hope – that they do not. Nevertheless, we might well embrace the idea of ghosts while rejecting that of gods.

But is survival of our bodily deaths a real possibility? And would having a second life confer meaning on the present one?

Is the concept of survival conceptually coherent?

I'll deal with these questions in turn.

Ask yourself, first, what it would be like for you yourself to survive your bodily death? What do you envisage yourself surviving as? I suspect it would give you little comfort to know that the molecules, atoms, or subatomic particles of which your physical body is composed are virtually immortal in so far as they will probably

survive as long as does the physical universe. These are not the parts of you that you think of when you think of your self surviving the death and dissolution of your physical body. So – once more – what do you survive *as*?

One hypothesis is that it is your soul that survives? But what is your soul? We commonly invoke the trilogy “body, mind, and soul”. But are these three things or just two? If three, then it would be nice to have some sort of guarantee that when your soul survives it will at least be accompanied by your mind. Otherwise, the survival of your soul as some sort of mindless, unthinking, unconscious entity, would carry as little significance as would the survival of your appendix in a test-tube of nutrient fluid.

The soul is nothing more than a hypothetical entity, invented by theologians and metaphysicians as the bearer of mental properties in much the same way as the ether was invented to be the bearer of light waves. We have no more warrant for believing in the soul than we do for believing in ectoplasm, the faked emissions of spiritualist mediums.

Hence, since it is the thinking, feeling, you – your conscious mind – that you want to survive, let’s drop the term “soul” from our discussion and concentrate instead on the ideas of minds and consciousness.

What exactly do you envisage when you think of your mind surviving the death of your physical body and brain?

You think of it, I submit, as some sort of non-physical object that can be detached from the body and its brain and [that can] go on existing in the absence of either.

But is this really the right way to think of it? Certainly language encourages to think so. After all, the word “mind” is a noun; and nouns – we have been taught – are naming words, and names stand for things or objects. Hence, we conclude, the noun “mind” must be the name of an object; and if not the name of a physical object, then surely of a non-physical one.

Problems for dualism.

But this idea raises a host of problematic questions. When, in the embryological story of the development of a human being from the union of sperm and ovum does this object, the mind, get “injected”, as it were, into the growing embryo? When, in the evolutionary story of the development of Homo Sapiens from more primitive primates, does this object, mind, enter the picture? More pertinently, if it is your mind that you identify with the “you” that is to survive your death, will it be the mind you had as a child, as a teenager, as an adult, or the mind you have in your dotage? And what of the minds of paranoid schizophrenics, imbeciles, still-borns, or aborted fetuses? Is the meaning of their lives to be found in the continuance of the minds they have at death?

When questions, like these, are so clearly imponderable – admitting only of arbitrary answers if any at all – we would do well to examine their presuppositions: in this case the presupposition that the mind really is some kind of substance or object.

But what might the mind be if it isn't a substance, thing, or object?

A non-dualistic conception of the mind.

The answer I would give is that when we talk about the mind we are simply talking of a cluster of mental attributes or properties: various dispositions, abilities, and activities; intellectual properties like being rational, emotional properties like being loving, artistic ones like being musical, and moral ones like being honest.

Now if the mind is not itself an object but rather a set of properties of an object, namely a set of properties of a physical body with a properly functioning brain, then the mind can no more continue to exist after the death of the physical body and brain than can a grin continue to exist after the disappearance of the face that does the grinning. To suppose otherwise is to commit what I call the “Cheshire Cat fallacy”. You may remember the wonderful passage in which Alice, while in Wonderland, chides the cat who keeps doing disappearing tricks:

“. . . I wish you wouldn't keep appearing and vanishing so suddenly: you make one quite giddy.”

“All right,” said the Cat; and this time it vanished quite slowly, beginning with the end of the tail, and ending with the grin, which remained some time after the rest of it had gone.

“Well! I've often seen a cat without a grin,” thought Alice; “but a grin without a cat! It's the most curious thing I ever saw in my life!”

Curious indeed. In fact, conceptually absurd.

If I am right, the idea that we – our minds, our souls, or our consciousnesses – might survive our bodily deaths in any meaningful way is a philosophical fiction as little deserving of rational belief as Lewis Carroll's story of the Cheshire Cat in *Alice in Wonderland* (Chapter VI).

I have a general piece of advice to offer here: In thinking about such allegedly deep and intractable questions as “What is the mind?”, “What is intelligence?”, or “What is consciousness?” – any question involving the name of some non-physical abstraction – *we do well to avoid the noun and concentrate instead on the corresponding verb, adverb, or adjective.* [Italics added.]

The question “What is consciousness?”, for instance, about which so many neuroscientists and philosophers currently seem so deeply puzzled, is better replaced by questions like “What is it to be conscious?” [the verb], “What is it to do something

consciously?” [the adverb], or “What is it for someone to be in a conscious state?” [the adjective].

It then becomes clear that the abstract noun “consciousness” isn’t the name of some elusive thing; it isn’t the name of a thing at all. To be conscious is to be aware; to do something consciously is to do it while being aware of what one is doing; to be in a conscious state is to be in a general state of awareness of one’s self or surroundings.

The fallacy of reification.

It is so easy, you see, for us to fall into the trap of reification: the tendency to think of an abstract noun as if it were the name of a real thing, object, or substance that is capable of independent existence. The fallacy of reification is epitomized for us in a passage from another of Lewis Carroll’s works, this time from *Through the Looking Glass*, Chapter VII:

“[The two Messengers have] both gone to the town. Just look along the road, and tell me if you can see either of them.”

“I see nobody on the road,” said Alice.

“I only wish I had such eyes,” the King remarked in a fretful tone. “To be able to see Nobody! And at that distance too! Why, it’s as much as I can do to see real people, by this light!”

As Peter Heath, in *The Philosopher’s Alice*, comments:¹⁶

Because ‘nobody’ functions grammatically very like ‘somebody’, there is a temptation to believe that it is the name of a peculiar, diaphanous sort of somebody, who is then unnecessarily added to the world’s inhabitants. In such a way does the language of abstraction darken counsel, corrupt communications, and beget bad philosophy, a theme much insisted on by Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, and their many modern successors.

Properly conceived, consciousness or awareness is a property of a living organism. It is a property that we human beings share – though to a different degree – with members of various other species such as alligators, bats, cats, dogs, elephants, frogs and gorillas (to list just a few in alphabetical order). Likewise with other mental properties like intellect, will, and emotion. Like the properties of having temperature and being fluid, all are emergent properties: properties possessed by complex objects though not by their simplest constituents, the molecules, atoms, subatomic particles from which they are constructed. All these mental properties are designed by what Richard Dawkins has called “The Blind Watchmaker”: they have emerged in the natural course of evolution.

¹⁶ Peter Heath, *The Philosopher’s Alice* [London, Academy Editions, 1974, p. 201].

The term “mind” is just a compendious way of referring to all such properties. None of them can exist in the absence of the organism that has them. It follows that none of them can continue to exist when the organism that had them is dead. When the organism dies, so does the mind, and so does consciousness.

Why survival wouldn't give meaning to life.

There is another grave problem facing the hypothesis that our lives here on earth wouldn't have any significance if all came to an end at the grave, that it would be meaningless unless we could look forward to life in another world. This hypothesis leads to the kind of absurdity that philosophers call an infinite regress. For in what would the meaning of this second life lie? In its sequel? And in what would lie the meaning of that sequel? Still another sequel? And the meaning of that? The answer gets postponed ad infinitum.

Once more, the question admits of no non-arbitrary answer. If any of the unending hypothetical series of “other” lives can have a meaning, surely this one – the one we have here on earth – can too.

For reasons like these, my answer to the question “What is the meaning of life?” is akin to the answer I would give to the question “What is the meaning of such and such a book?” The meaning of a book is to be found in the words, the sentences, the paragraphs, and the chapters it contains. Likewise, the meaning of life is to be found in the meaningful moments, episodes, and achievements that occur within our brief appearance here on earth. A book doesn't lack meaning because it comes to an end on the last page. Nor do our lives lack meaning because they come to an end when all neural activity ceases.

To be sure, some lives are lived in meaningless fashion. Some lives are lived in pursuit of goals which we can only deplore. But the lives of still others, gifted by nature or favored by circumstance, will have value not just for themselves but for others. And some – by virtue of their physical, intellectual, artistic, moral, or social achievements – may even achieve a different kind of “immortality”: they may live on in the memories of those who follow them.

No gods are needed to give our lives meaning. No future life is needed to give meaning to the present life. We ourselves can choose to give our lives meaning, purpose, and value right here and now. [Italics added.]

Or can we?

Opinions differ on the matter.

C: FREE WILL, FATALISM AND OTHER THREATS TO THE MEANING OF LIFE.

On the one hand, it is indisputable that we do, at least in many circumstances, believe ourselves able to exercise freedom of choice and freedom of action. The concept of free will is entrenched in our commonsense beliefs and ordinary language. We can and do distinguish between the freedom conferred on some by virtue of economic status, education, and good health, for instance, and the relative powerlessness of others who are handicapped by poverty, ignorance, or disease. The choices open to one may not be open to another. The freedoms enjoyed by the master are not enjoyed by the slave. The freedoms of the jailer are not enjoyed by the prisoner. The freedoms of oppressors are not enjoyed by those who are their victims. These differences do in fact exist. We recognize them in practice as well as in theory. And we mark them, in language, by talk of various kinds and degrees of freedom, or its absence.

Yet, on the other hand, many philosophical arguments have been advanced to show that commonsense and ordinary language are fallible guides to truth. The truth of the matter, it has been argued, is that free will is an illusion since we are all in fact mere slaves of fate, products of and subject to the constraints of laws that rule our lives.

Two main arguments have been advanced in support of this fatalistic conclusion. One has to do with the laws of logic; the other with laws of nature.

The threat from Logical Determinism.

The first is an argument from the doctrine that all of reality – whether past, present, or future – is subject to the laws of logic. These are laws, theologians have usually conceded, that even an almighty God cannot violate.

One of these laws is the Law of Excluded Middle which says that every statement must be either true or, if not true, false (there being no “middle” possibilities). Another is the Law of Identity which says that if a statement is true then it is true, and if false, then false. Applied to statements about future events, these yield the obvious conclusions:

*Either it is true that such and such an event will occur or it is false;
If it is true that it is going to occur then – of necessity – it is going to occur;
If it is false that it is going to occur then – of necessity – it is not going to occur.*

Generalizing, we infer:
The future will be what it will be.

And from this we infer, in turn:
You can't change the future from what it is going to be any more than you can change the past from what it was.

At this point, the dark clouds of fatalism seem to threaten our cherished belief in free will. We may well be tempted to start thinking of our lives as mere pawns of fate. Hence the famous stanza from Fitzgerald's *The Rubaiyat* of Omar Khayyam:

'Tis all a Checker-board of Nights and Days
Where Destiny with Men for Pieces plays:
Hither and thither moves, and mates, and slays,
And one by one back in the closet lays.

Each of these statements is an expression of the doctrine that I once christened as "Logical Determinism", a doctrine which – even expressed in these general terms – seems to imply that the future is fated and that we are powerless to do anything about it.

Over forty-five years ago, I tried to illustrate how easy it is to draw fatalistic conclusions from Logical Determinism by writing an article entitled "Must the Future Be What It Is Going to Be?",¹⁷ in which I predicted that a fellow doctoral student at the Australian National University – Bob Hawke – would one day be Prime Minister of Australia. Now obviously, if my prediction was true at the time when I made it, then Bob was indeed going to become Prime Minister, and there was nothing that anyone could do to prevent this since otherwise my statement would have been false. Equally obviously, if my prediction was false, then Bob would never become Prime Minister, and there was nothing that anyone could do to make him Prime Minister, since otherwise my statement would have been true. No matter what final outcome the future held, in neither case could anyone do anything to change it from what it was going to be.

But – I asked – does this imply that Bob's future was fixed or fated in advance, irrespective of his own choices in the matter?

The fatalist fallacy.

My answer, now as then, is "No." To conclude that it does is to suppose that what the future is going to be owes nothing to an individual's goals, ambitions, or choices. It is to suppose that our wills are causally inefficacious, that none of our efforts or strivings can have any effect.

Bob Hawke did indeed become Prime Minister of Australia. But not because of blind fate or string-pulling deities, let alone because of my predictions. He became what he became with the help of others, no doubt, but at least in part because of his own ambitions, his own efforts, and his own political will. No one who knew him – as I did in his capacity as neighbor, friend, and occasional baby-sitter – could ever deny him that. True, nature and nurture may have given him those ambitions and political

¹⁷ Raymond D. Bradley, "Must the Future Be What It Is Going to Be?" *Mind*, April, 1959.

will. And political circumstances may have fostered his plans. But they operated, as it were, through him, not despite him.

It wasn't my prediction's being true that made him Prime Minister. It was his becoming Prime Minister that made my prediction true. Bob Hawke gave his own life meaning by aiming for, and achieving – among other things – his status as political leader of Australia.

The laws of logic don't imply fatalism. The answer to the factual question as to whether someone's choices and actions will make a difference to the future cannot be deduced from the logical truth that the future will be what it will be. True, we can't change the future from what it is going to be. But the fact remains that what it is going to be may – to some extent – be a consequence of what we do in the present.

[Actually, Dear, I think that Bradley didn't present the above very well. I would have much preferred if he had pointed out (as I have done in earlier chapters, e.g., in the two T-chapters dealing with "Truth") not only that Aristotelian logic has serious limitations (e.g., to non-changing entities!) but also the crucial, fundamental point that in the "open system" known as reality, no statement can be known to be true (or false) – including that one! Instead, we're forced to deal with probabilities.

[As a result, the original prediction that Bradley made about Bob Hawke (becoming Prime Minister) was doubly foolish. On the one hand, to be realistic, then at most he should have said something similar to, "There's an xx% chance that Bob will become Prime Minister". And on the other hand, he should have been challenged to provide analysis to support his prediction. Subsequently, when it was obvious to all that he was attempting to make a prediction about the evolution of an incredibly nonlinear system (viz., Bob's life during the next yy years), then his silly prediction should have been sufficiently ridiculed that he would have withdrawn it – in shame for attempting what even an omniscient god couldn't do, i.e., predict the evolution of an manifestly nonlinear system!

[Stated more succinctly: in the open system known as reality, there's no such thing as "logical determinism"; instead, "logical determinism" applies only in closed systems, such as games (e.g., all religions). Thus, if Bob were playing baseball, then if he gets three strikes, he's out, but if Bob is planning to run for Prime Minister, then there's no way to know the outcome until it materializes.]

The threat from Causal Determinism.

A second argument for the illusoriness of free will is derived from what we call Causal Determinism: the belief that there are exceptionless causal laws connecting states of affairs and events such that, for any system governed by such laws, the state of the system at any given time determines a unique state of the system for any later time. This doctrine is implicit in such claims as "Everything has a cause", "Things don't just happen", and "Nature is law-governed". It holds that the past determines the present, and the present determines the future.

[Sorry for another interruption, Dear, but recall from earlier chapters (e.g., U, dealing with “Ubiquitous Uncertainties”) that “Causal Determinism” is valid at most for simple, linear, nonquantum systems: for nonlinear systems (such as the weather and such as people!) uncertainties in initial conditions will soon overwhelm, making predictions of future states even theoretically impossible. Stated differently, “causal determinism” is a concept appropriate only for linear systems obeying Newton’s principles; subsequent science has shown that it’s of limited validity. Consequently, this essay’s section on “Causal Determinism” is going to be as inappropriate (for nonlinear systems such as a people’s lives) as was the essay’s previous section on “Logical Determinism”.]

Now, according to the arguments I’ve advanced so far, reality has no place for a supernatural domain, either one inhabited by gods or one inhabited by ghosts. The only world that exists is the natural one, the material one, the world that we can best learn about by observation and experiment, the methods of scientific inquiry.

Man, so conceived, is a wholly natural being, and like any other natural being, is subject to the laws of nature.

But, once more, there is an apparent problem with this conception. If we, like other natural entities, are products of nature, then what account are we to give of free will? To what extent, if at all, do we have control over our own destinies? What meaning or significance could our lives have if we are designed to be what we are by the “blind” processes of evolution?

The plausibility of Causal Determinism stems largely from the success of the various sciences in providing causal explanations of why things behave as they do: things like the motions of the heavenly bodies; the rise and fall of the tides; the rising and setting of the sun; the recurrence of the seasons; the workings of machines; the incidence of disease. Thus it used to be said that every scientific inquiry presupposes the truth of the Causal Principle, “Every event has a cause” (i.e., the existence of causal laws “governing” the phenomena under investigation), and that every success of science confirms its truth.

[Well, Bradley did “weasel” at bit by saying, “it used to be said that every scientific inquiry presupposes the truth of the Causal Principle”, but I don’t like where Bradley seems to be trying to lead the reader! The point is: every thing DOES have a cause, but it doesn’t follow that it’s possible (even theoretically) to predict the outcome! In quantum mechanics, the best one can do is predict probabilities for specific outcomes. For nonlinear systems (e.g., the atmosphere, people’s lives, etc.), uncertainties in the initial conditions will soon dominate, making it impossible to predict the future.]

With the arguable exception of events in the microphysical world of quantum physics, causal laws seem to apply quite universally throughout the universe, not just to inanimate objects but animate ones as well. Even human beings and their behavior

seem to lend themselves to causal explanations by various life sciences. Consider the biological sciences such as genetics, endocrinology, molecular biology, etc. They abound in causal explanations for why we do what we do; so do the behavioral sciences of psychology, sociology, etc. That much human behavior is determined by an interplay between nature and nurture – not to be identified with heredity and environment, respectively – seems clear. Couldn't all of it be?

In the minds of some thinkers, the answer must be “No”. For Causal Determinism, like Logical Determinism, seems to have fatalistic implications that would render the notions of free will, responsibility, and the meaningfulness of life itself totally illusory.

The great physicist Sir Arthur Eddington – an early promoter of Einstein's Relativity Theory – voiced this objection when he asked:

What significance is there in my mental struggle tonight whether I shall or shall not give up smoking, if the laws which govern the physical universe already preordain for the morrow a configuration of matter constituted of pipe, tobacco, and smoke connected with my lips? (*Philosophy*, 1933)

According to Eddington, the concepts of significance and freedom can be rescued only by denying the universality of Causal Determinism and embracing the so-called indeterminacy of quantum physics.

Yet this conclusion is fraught with difficulties. The argument is that we can't really have significant freedom if what we do is determined by what we are, and what we are is itself determined by factors over which we have no control.

But by the same token it is hard to see how our acts can be free if what we do is determined by what we are and what we are is undetermined in the sense of being the outcome of mere chance.

We seem to be faced with a dilemma: Either what we are is the outcome of causal factors in the past or it is the outcome of sheer indeterministic chance. Yet in neither case can [we] really be in control of what we are, or – it is further argued – of what we do?

How might one escape from the horns of this dilemma; the so-called “Determinism or Chance Dilemma”?

One option, countenanced by Eddington and numerous other thinkers, is to take recourse to a dualistic conception of the human being: the supposition that our immaterial minds, or souls, stand outside the material world and interpose themselves in the causal breaks postulated by quantum indeterminacy. As he put it:

...we must attribute to the mind power not only to decide the behavior of atoms individually but to affect systematically large groups – in fact to tamper with the odds on atomic behavior.¹⁸

Likewise, Nobel Prize laureate Sir John Eccles speculated that the mind or soul can intervene in the otherwise orderly flow of deterministic laws by virtue of indeterminacy at the microphysical level. He even suggested that free will may be located between the synapses in the brain

But this hypothesis will not do, for two main reasons.

First, it presupposes the kind of dualism that we have already seen reason to reject: a dualism that sees reality as comprising two sorts of realms, the natural and the supernatural, the physical and the spiritual, the material and the immaterial. It thinks of the mind or soul as a mysterious entity that can violate the laws of nature. In short, it thinks of mind or soul as an entity that transcends the world of nature, one whose acts – designated acts of free will – are nothing short of miracles.

Second, this conception of free will offers only a temporary respite from the difficulties posed by the Determinism or Chance dilemma. For the dilemma arises again with respect to the postulated mind or soul. How did we come to have it? Was it preordained for us, by God perhaps, or by other causal factors in the spiritual domain? Or did we get it just by chance? In either case we seem to have no choice in the matter. After all, it is not up to us to choose the nature of our immaterial minds or souls any more than it is up to us to choose what genes we inherit from our parents or what chance mutations our genes may have undergone. Clearly, there is no escaping this dilemma.

The conclusions we are forced to, if we accept the presuppositions of this dilemma, are stark ones. No one ever does, or even can, make genuine choices or act freely. No one is really free in a deep sense of the word, any beliefs to the contrary being shallowly conceived. No one is ever truly responsible for his or her actions since there is no possible circumstance – whether in a deterministic world or in an indeterministic one, whether in a natural world or a supernatural one – in which we choose, or have control over, the self that is “given” to us. Ultimately, we are puppets of the fates of causality or chance, living lives that are meaningless.

According to this line of reasoning, there are no conceivable circumstances, no possible worlds, in which the concepts of freedom, responsibility, or meaningfulness have any application. These conclusions, if correct, would have profound consequences, not only for our theoretical conception of our status in the universe, but also for our practical dealings with our fellows: it would mean that our ordinary

¹⁸ Sir Arthur Eddington, *The Nature of the Physical World*, p.313; quoted by L. Susan Stebbing, *Philosophy and the Physicists*, p.163.

practices of praising and blaming, of assigning responsibility in private judgments or in courts of law, would be unfounded and without justification.

The fallacy of persuasive redefinition.

But we don't have to accept these bleak and counterintuitive conclusions. The reasoning from which they are derived involves an all too common kind of fallacy: *the fallacy of persuasive redefinition*. [Italics added.]

Let me illustrate in terms of a different example: the concept of solidity. Just as we ordinarily distinguish between circumstances in which we are free and ones in which we are not, so we also distinguish between objects that are solid and ones that are not. A concrete floor and a thick plank of sound wood are solid; marshy ground and rotten planks are not. As Aristotle pointed out: "it is the business of the language of 'properties', as also of definitions, to distinguish."¹⁹

Now consider an argument which purports to conjure this distinction away. Arthur Eddington once claimed that if we were able to inspect a block of concrete at the sub-microscopic level we would see that the molecules and atoms of which it is composed are at least as distant from one another as the planets in our solar system. At the "deep" level of atomic physics, he pointed out, our block of solid concrete and our solid plank are full of empty space. He even went to so far as to suggest that this profound discovery had radical practical consequences: stepping on a concrete floor or a solid plank, he concluded, is as risky as stepping on a swarm of flies. We ordinary folk, he claimed, are shallow folk who don't understand what "solid" really means. Its real meaning is such that nothing ever has the property of being solid.

But this is preposterous. Eddington seems ignorant of Aristotle's point about the function of language. It is not we who don't understand the meaning of "solid"; it is Eddington. He has used seemingly subtle and sophisticated reasoning to try to persuade us that our commonsensical beliefs are mistaken. But in fact all he has done is to try to persuade us to forget the ordinary criteria for the use of the word 'solid' and adopt new ones. He is trying to persuade us to redefine the word 'solid'. Yet, if we were to accept his redefinition of the term, we'd not have learned a new fact about the world; we'd merely have fallen victim to his word-play. The old distinction between what one can safely rely on to support one's tread would now have to be marked by a new pair of words. Instead of saying that the concrete is solid whereas the marshy ground is not, we'd have to say something like "The concrete is *dolid* but the marshy ground is not *dolid*." We'd have changed our language but made no advance in our understanding of how the world works.

Much the same needs to be said, I submit, about the reasoning of those who would try to persuade us – on the grounds given above – that no-one is ever "genuinely", "really", "truly", or "ultimately" free in the allegedly "deep" sense of the word "free". The weasel-words ("genuinely", "really", "truly", or "ultimately" and "deep") are the

¹⁹ Aristotle, *Topics*, Bk. V, para. 2, 130b.

give-away. *They are sure signs that a linguistic conjuring job is taking place.* [Italics added.] We are being subjected to an attempt to persuade us to abandon what we ordinarily mean by the words “free” and “not free”, and to adopt new – allegedly “deeper” – criteria for their application. But we make no advance if we go along with these persuasive arguments. We would still need to find words to distinguish between the master and the slave, the warden and the prisoner, the cases where we make choices and those in which we don’t, and so on. All that will have changed is that we will have had to invent new words for the old distinction, new bottles for the old wine.

Those who have tried to persuade us that we are never “really” free have subjected us to nothing more than semantic sophistry. [Italics added.]

This should become clear when we step back and take a closer look at one of the presuppositions relied on by both horns of the dilemma with which they try to confront us: the presupposition that if I have no control over what I am, because – in the final analysis – I don’t choose what I am,²⁰ then I have no control over which acts I will perform.

Is this presupposition true?

I think not. From the indisputable fact that – ultimately – we don’t choose, and hence aren’t responsible for, what we are, it does not follow that we don’t choose, or aren’t responsible for, what we do. In other words, from the fact that nature, nurture – and perhaps even sheer chance – make us what we are, it doesn’t follow that we ourselves don’t play a role in determining what actions we will perform. Equally, from the fact that neither the master nor the slave chose their parents or the circumstances in which they would be born, it doesn’t follow that the master can’t make choices and exercise freedoms that are unavailable to the slave. We all know that he can.

The doctrine of Causal Determinism is consistent with the view that Eddington’s morrow is determined in part by what he does today. It does not commit us to saying that his tomorrow is determined independently of what he does today.²¹ Causal Determinism says that the future is determined by the present and the present by the past. It certainly does not say that the future is determined irrespective of what happens in the present.

²⁰ It is obvious that, in the final analysis, I don’t choose what I am. Let us use the term “self” as an abbreviation for the expression “what I am”. Then, unless my self has existed for all eternity along with God (a supposition that nobody would seriously entertain), it is obvious that there must have been a temporal beginning to my self, to what I am. And this original self cannot – without contradiction – be supposed to have been chosen by an earlier stage of my self. This conclusion holds no matter what metaphysical status we assign to the self: whether we conceive it as a spiritual entity, or a material one, or as a composite of two such entities.

²¹ Raymond D. Bradley, “Causality, Fatalism, and Morality”, *Mind*, October, 1963.

Causal Determinism, in short, no more implies Fatalism than does Logical Determinism. [And, Dear, I wish that Bradley had added, here, that neither Causal Determinism nor Logical Determinism dominate any human's life! That is, both these "Determinisms" are inappropriate, because in the open system known as "reality", we humans never get to deal with certainties, only probabilities!] As I put it earlier with respect to Bob Hawke's political ambitions and machinations, his nature and nurture may well have given him these. But they operated through him, not despite him. Likewise with Arthur Eddington. The laws of nature, both those of nature and those of nurture, may well have determined what decision he would make about whether or not to smoke the next day. But these, once more, operate through him, not despite him. Both were free agents to the extent that they were neither compelled to do what they did nor prevented from doing what they chose to do.

The notions of free will and responsibility, and the sort of significance we attach to both, are in no way compromised by our conception of man as a wholly natural being.

Nor are they in any way compromised by the supposition that what we are is a consequence of factors – deterministic or indeterministic – over which we have no control. The kind of freedom that is required if we are to live our lives in meaningful fashion isn't threatened either by determinism as such, or by indeterminism as such. It is threatened only by causes and accidents that prevent us from acting in ways we choose or that compel us to act in ways we do not choose.

Thus if Bob Hawke had chosen to pursue a political career and had been prevented from doing so by ill health or accidental incapacitation, for instance, then to that extent he would not have been free. And if Arthur Eddington had chosen to give up smoking but had been in the grip of an addiction to continue, then to that extent he too would not have been free to act otherwise. But in the absence of such compulsions or impediments to action both were free to act as they chose. And the lives of both men, politician and physicist respectively, had a significance that was in no way impaired by the fact that they were products of evolution, nature's blind designer.

As it was with them, so it can be with us.

[Dear: As I mentioned in the **W**-chapter, Ed Lorenz (1917–2008) concocted a way to terminate arguments about free will. Recall that he was the MIT meteorologist who was first to see that uncertainties in initial conditions, no matter how small (e.g., a butterfly flapping its wings in Brazil), make it impossible (even for a god!) to predict the evolution of nonlinear systems (such as people's behavior). Therefore, by the way, no god could be omniscient. In his book *The Essence of Chaos*, Lorenz wrote (and at the end of his e-mails when he was in his eighties he would commonly quote): "We must wholeheartedly believe in free will. If free will is a reality, we shall have made the correct choice. If it is not, we shall still not have made an incorrect choice, because we shall not have made any choice at all, not having a free will to do so."

[Lorenz's statement, however, seems to be just a way to terminate discussion about free will, rather than address the issue. To address the issue, using Lorenz' discovery about the impossibility of predicting the future of nonlinear systems (given the inevitable uncertainties in initial conditions), one could say: "Yes, everything has a cause, but just as it's impossible to predict the consequences to hurricane development of the jump of a particular grasshopper in Africa, it's impossible to link a particular feature in a person's nature or nurture to what the individual will do on a specific occasion. And just as the dominant cause in the development of a particular hurricane depends on specific ocean temperature and wind shear encountered by some eddy, so to, a person's reaction to a given set of existing circumstance (if you will, his exercise of his "will") depends on dominant features of his current disposition (e.g., ideas in book he recently read, how badly his head aches, how tight his shoes are, how worried he is about violating customs or laws, his reaction to singing birds, his running scenarios of consequences in his mind, etc.). From among all such current stimulations, he chooses what to do; some people call that "free will"; others describe it as "making a decision".]

To repeat what I said earlier: "No gods are needed to give our lives meaning. No future life is needed to give meaning to the present life. We ourselves can choose to give our lives meaning, purpose, and value right here and now." In short, life can have meaning in the natural, purely material, world – the one with which we are all familiar.

Now, Dear, although I wholeheartedly agree with Bradley's concluding paragraph (immediately above), yet as I indicated in my notes added within the text of his essay, I think that his discussion of "free will" leaves quite a bit to be desired. In particular, the idea of "logical determinism" has nothing to do with reality and the idea of "casual determination" has limited applicability: yes, everything has a cause, but in reality, "casual determinism" is possible only for simple, linear, nonquantum systems. As a result, no one (not even a god!) can "determine" a person's future.

More significantly, Dear, is that, in my opinion, the enormous amount that has been written about "free will" (e.g., try that exact expression in Google, and you'll get more than 20 million links!) has almost entirely been a waste of mental energy, ink, and bandwidth! The important point is, that both now and in the future, adults are held accountable for their decisions – by Mother Nature, by their families, by their acquaintances, by their societies, and maybe most importantly, by themselves. That is, whether or not free will exists (and I doubt that anyone argues that decisions are made independent from our instincts, emotions, and experiences), the important point is: adults are held responsible for their choices and actions. In making such decisions,

the existence or nonexistence of “free will” isn’t important; what’s important is “will power”!

Stated differently, in the real world, adults make decisions – they choose options – and are held responsible for the choices. Philosophers argue about whether anyone has “free will” to make such decisions (arguing that any choice was pre-ordained by the individual’s experiences), but people with common sense respond with something similar to: “**Whatever! Robots aren’t responsible for their actions, but people are!**”

Thus, Dear, when you come to a “branching point” in your life, when you’re required to make a decision (even if your decision is to refuse to decide!), then you (in contrast to some programmed automaton) are expected (by your society, by those who know you...) to consider the outcomes of different possibilities: you’re expected to run different scenarios in your mind, consider the consequences of your different choices, estimate relevant probabilities for each choice, etc., and then choose. For example, if you encounter the need to obtain some money, then you’re expected to consider the options of trying to mooch the money from someone, trying to get a loan or another job, becoming a prostitute, robbing a bank, or whatever. Philosophers who argue that there’s no such thing as “free will” will say that you had no choice: what you decide to do is “pre-ordained” by the “programming” you’ve been subjected to throughout your life, as if you were nothing but a robot. But the rest of us say: “**Free will or not, you have a decision to make, and as an adult, you’re responsible for your decisions.**”

All of which, little one, then leads to the need for you (with or without “free will”) to make some decisions: you’ve been “programmed” by your parents and your Mormon acquaintances to adopt certain premisses, e.g., about the nature of reality (alleged to contain “supernatural entities”) and about how to gain knowledge about that reality (e.g., by “**listening to your heart**”). But as an adult, Dear, you’re responsible for your own decisions about, e.g., what premisses you’ll adopt and how you’ll test them – or will you adopt them without testing them? How are you going to gain knowledge about the reality external to your mind? What will you choose for the purpose(s) of your life? What, then, will be your values?

In subsequent chapter, I’ll dig deeper to examine some of your possible choices, but already there’s an obvious question for you: in your worldview, what value do you assign to getting substantially more exercise?!