Classical Theism (15):
The Logical Problem of Evil and the Free Will Defense (3)

The positive: kills the *logical* problem of evil
The negative: it is not *actually* true, and it does not work

Bible Doctrines (The True-Good-Beautiful)

T/G/B
Eschatology
Thanatology
Ecclesiology
Israelology
Dispensationalism
Doxology
Hodology
Soteriology
Hamartiology
Natural Law
Anthropology
Angelology
Pneumatology
Christology
Paterology
Trinitarianism
Cosmology
Theology Proper
Bibliology
Natural Theology

5: Hermeneutics

4: Language-96

3: Epistemology 32
 - Existence 50
 - History 50

2: Metaphysics 32
 - Trans. 50

1: Reality
 - Logic 32,
 - Truth 32

P.R. - 32

Opening passages: Matthew 22:37-39; Col. 1:9-17; Acts 17:28; Psa 73:25.
Preparation for the Word of God: Our free will is tied to our character; thus, we are not free in desires.
3 Parts to Bible Class: the importance of a real genuine Christian education in the church on God.
Part I: Spiritual basics-1 slide: The spiritual, theological, and metaphysical nature of love (2).
Part II: Philosophical foundations-1 slide. POL: completion of Wittgenstein.
Part III: Doctrinal development: Classical theism 14: The Free Will Defense (3).
Part I: The biblical, spiritual, and metaphysical nature of love (2).
1. Metaphysics/anthropology: Love drives everything in our lives. The only question is whether our loves are rightly ordered or disordered, cf., Matt. 6.24.
2. All of our actions are *determined* by what we love as we reflect on the different orders or levels of goods. There can be no denial that the fabric of our entire lives is made up of love.
3. Love cannot be separated from the intellect and the will working together. While we can talk of them differently, they are not entirely separate faculties.
4. Man is a unified being who sees, and who desires in accordance with what he sees, and who has some continual slight control of the direction and focus of his vision.
5. We have control, to some degree, over priority of perceptions.
6. Rightly ordered love requires virtue, which requires a mature intellect and will.
7. A virtuous person thinks rightly and desires rightly.
8. An immature person is weak and does not think rightly or wish rightly.
9. An immature person is doomed to spiritual failure due to his weaknesses in thought and desire.
10. The will influences our beliefs, for better or for worse. No one is an impersonal rational thinker.
11. The mandate to love and love illustrated, Luke 10:27-37.
12. Spiritual love as the root, hinge, fruit, efficient cause, and formal cause of all virtue., 1 Cor. 13.
13. Love & F-ship with God. Does 1 John teach confession of sin for virtue and life, fellowship, & growth in God or does it emphasize love? 1 John 2:5, 15; 3:10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23; 4:7, 8, 11, 12, 16-21; 5:2-3
14. We are creatures of vision and desire in a deterministic fashion—no rational person is free from love.
15. No rational person chooses anything apart from what he loves. It comes down to the assignment of various values to all of the "goods" that surround our lives.

Ludwig Wittgenstein
British-Austrian Philosopher

"If we spoke a different language, we would perceive a somewhat different world."

1. Three key ages of philosophy.
   a. Ancient: metaphysics for ultimate reality.
   b. Modern: epistemology (Descartes).
   c. Contemporary: language (Analytical)
2. Analytical philosophy is all about analysis of language rather than reality. It is anti-metaphysical and thus very flat.
3. Wittgenstein believed one can see the structure of the world through propositions. In other words, language enables us to know beings. His later work attempted to make a bridge from language to reality.
4. However, consider pre-linguistic thought as we seek words to express thought.
5. Wittgenstein's language game and language community theories has all but been accepted among virtually all modern evangelical writers on hermeneutics (Anthony C. Thiselton, Grant Osborne, Grant Osborne, Randolf Tate, Moises Silva, Van Houser, Alvin Plantinga, even Ryrie—they are all Wittgensteinians in POL.
6. The difference between looking at the objective meaning in realism vs. community usage and significance in exegesis.
7. Consider how the analytical/flat method influences contemporary Christianity & doctrinal movement (cf., volition, love, SL)

1. A few words about the methodology in this series (expect to be confused).

   a. We will see the historical dialogue on the POE to see what works and what does not work. We will end up with understanding the 10 fallacies of Mackie's arguments and the POE in Job.

   b. Expose false solutions.
      ✓ Free Will Defense.
      ✓ Molinism.
      ✓ Evil as a *necessary* means to an end.

   c. Remove and replace false views of
      ✓ God
      ✓ Omnipotence
      ✓ Evil
      ✓ Free will
      ✓ Theodicy
      ✓ Reality.

2. We are now in the midst of the Free Will Defense.
    ✓   The positive: killed the logical problem of evil.
    ✓   The negatives: not true, not biblical defensible, offers no theodicy, and retains many false views on the nature of God, omnipotence, free will, and evil.
    ✓   If the world had one less evil, would it be a better world? Then why doesn't God give us that world since He is all-powerful and all-good and opposes evil?

3. Overview of the biblical data on the human will with overview of views of classical libertarianism, compatible, and determinism, Jer. 13:23; John 16:7-15; Rom. 1:24-32; 3:10-11; 7:15-25; 8:5-8; Eph. 2:1-3, 4:17-20; Philip 2:12-13; Col. 1:16-17; 2 Thess. 2:1-12; 1 Pet. 2:8; Heb. 1:3; Rev. 13:8; 17:17.

4. The Free Will Defense is a non-starter for the Realist because it views free will as autonomous and free from any antecedent factors like wishes, norms, standards, and God's efficient causality. The idea of an autonomous free will is deistic. Good metaphysics, like good theology, stops nonsense talk.

Examples of Free Will Defense from philosophical writings.

a. "Of course, it is up to God whether to create free creatures at all; but if He aims to produce moral good, then He must create significantly free creatures upon whose cooperation He must depend. This is the power of an omnipotent God limited by the freedom He confers on creatures."

(Examples of Free Will Defense from philosophical writings)

b.   "It is not logically possible for an agent to make another agent such that necessarily he freely does only good actions. Hence, if a being G creates a free agent, He gives to the agent power of choice between alternative actions, how he will exercise that power is something which G cannot control while the agent remains free. It is a good thing that there exist free agents, but a logically consequence of their existence is that their power to choose to do evil actions may sometimes be realized. The price is worth paying, however, for the existence of agents performing free actions remains a good thing even if they sometimes do evil. Hence, it is not logically possible that a creature create free creatures 'such that necessarily they do not do evil actions.'"

(Examples of Free Will Defense from philosophical writings)

c. "It is a great good that humans have a certain sort of freedom which I shall call free and responsible choice, but if they do, then necessarily there will be the natural possibility of moral evil. . . A God who gives humans such free will necessarily brings about the possibility, and puts moral evil outside His own control whether or not it occurs. It is not logically possible—that is, it would be self-contradictory to suppose—that God could give us such free will and yet ensure that we always use it the right way."

(Examples of Free Will Defense from philosophical writings)

d. "In a world inhabited by significantly free persons, whether there is moral evil or not depends upon these free persons. It is up to them whether they will choose to do right or wrong in a morally significant situation. If they are capable of doing right, at the same time they are capable of doing wrong. If they choose to do wrong, God cannot prevent them from doing that wrong, or even choosing it, without removing their significant freedom."

5. Although I am **not** in sympathy with the Free Will Defense for several significant biblical and philosophical reasons, *I DO BELIEVE IN FREE WILL.* A few problems:

   a. Classical libertarianism is very problematic. Are we really free to want what we want? Is the will really "primitive"?

   b. The idea that God cannot create free creatures who do not sin is problematic.

   c. The idea that God creates a law where evil is necessary for a good is problematic because it makes God create a law for something that He is suppose to oppose, namely evil.

   d. The idea that God needs evil for good is problematic.

   e. The idea that God knew ahead who would be negative, as per Molinism, creates more problems than it solves.

   f. It does not give us a proper view of God, man, free will, evil, or even good. God is viewed with a hands-off attitude—again, deistic.

6. The issue of free will is an issue for the Christian because it seems as if we are free, but the Word of God teaches that everything is decreed by God. In other words, God ordains all things. Philosophy is a great help for understanding and clarifying these problems.

7. Overview of libertarianism: choices are not determined by antecedent conditions. Moreover, if God rewound history, you could have done otherwise. The question arises as to why God put us or Manson in our surroundings.

8.   Libertarianism, determinism, and compatibilism compared.

   a.   If I am free, then I am not determined. If I am determined then I am not free. Determinism vs. indeterminism.

   b.   Libertarianism teaches that there are no antecedent cause—no prior causes, but what about Gods' will, which is prior? In libertarianism the will is viewed as "primitive." Libertarianism is indeterminate.

   c.   Compatibilism holds to both freedom and determinism. Free choices are made according to antecedent causes. There is a sense in which the past does "determine" future free choices. The freedom is always viewed in terms of free choices, cf., Peter's denial of the Lord.

   d.   Determinism exists in both psychology (Sigmund Freud, William James) as well as in theology (hard Calvinists). All things are determined and it could not be otherwise.

PRINCIPLES ON THE NATURE OF MAN

1. Before one can understand freedom of man, he must understand the basic nature of man.

2. Man's intellect is drawn to truth. When the intellect finds truth, it rests in it because its possess what it wants.

3. Man's will is drawn to the good and rests when it finds the good.

4. Freedom comes in degrees because goods comes in degrees.

5. The intellect presents to the will the various possibilities. We are free because we can choose different goods.

PRINCIPLES ON THE NATURE OF MAN

6.   In Heaven all are free; in Hell no one is free.

7.   Self-deception comes from the will. It is the will that moves the intellect to consider something good as bad. It can trick the intellect by ignoring and focusing on other things. This is how deception works.

8.   True freedom is found when the will possess the good without being coerced.

9. Becoming more mature is all about becoming more virtuous, which brings harmony between the intellect and the will. In maturity the intellect is trained to see the good the way it is suppose to be seen, and the will is properly oriented to the good. Virtue is the acquiring of habits so that you think rightly and will rightly and feel rightly—to possess a well ordered intellect and will. To be mature is to be strong and this brings success.

10. An immature believer lacks virtue (good strength) and because he is weak regarding his will and mind, he will always fail since he will think, wish, and seek wrongly. He is a bad thinker and possesses a bad appetite.

11. It is all about actualizing potentials on a natural and supernatural level. This is why the Bible emphasizes doing—do this and don't do that. With a mature and strong will, the believer has the power to turn the intellect in the right direction.

12. Good character pursues the good things and is happy, but a character that is weak is not free nor happy and the more such a person sins, the more he becomes a slave to sin.

DIVINE CONCURRENCE AND HUMAN FREE WILL

1. In every act there is both primary (infinite) and secondary (finite) causality.

2. While the two causes can be cognitively distinguished, they are inextricable and would not exist apart from each other.

3. Man's free will is given its existential act by God. No act can exist apart from God—none! No such thing as an autonomous free will.

4. God sustains the free will and all of its acts every instant as the primary cause.

5. However, man is the secondary cause and gives *form* to the act in his secondary causality.

DIVINE CONCURRENCE AND HUMAN FREE WILL

6.   So, God is the efficient cause of all things that be, but man gives the formal cause of free will acts.

7.   The form finds its source in man's intentionality.

8.   For example, when a rapist rapes a woman, both God and man are involved in the existence of all that exists.

9.   God is the efficient causality in giving existence to the rapist and the rapee along with all of their activities.

10. But God is not the formal cause of the act, namely rape.

11. The form is what makes things be what they are. In this case, what makes rape rape is in the finite agent, not God.

12. God is the infinite cause and man is the finite cause of all activities.

13. Everything that is in being in the rape is caused to be by God, but what makes rape rape in the moral order comes from its form from man.

14. Again, it is the finite agent who is the principle cause of the form of the act or the effect.

15. Neither the infinite agent nor the finite agent brings about activities alone. The former leads to determinism the later to libertarianism.

16. There is a certain mystery in concurrence that can be compared to a chemical reaction in which one no longer sees the separate chemicals.

17. Libertarianism violates the basic principle of divine concurrence.
    a. It violates the principles of *Esse* and the metaphysics of act and potential. A thing cannot actualize itself.
    b. In libertarianism the action of the will is up to the agent's power. So, a free act is never the effect of God's power.
    c. In libertarianism antecedent factors are not an issue.
    d. In libertarianism there is no divine concurrence moving the will from potential to actual.
    e. Libertarianism is a result of anthropomorphizing God. If one paints God in anthropomorphic terms, not only will the arguments from the atheists take on more weight, the believer will be disoriented and his faith will be shaken when he runs into a crisis and "his" God does not seem to be there—one who is well behaved, good, and moral like one would expect from a man-like God.

18. In making everything be, God's causality extends to everything that exists, and free choices are as real as anything else in the world.

19. There is no such thing as a creaturely reality, which is not produced or creatively made to be by God.

20. From a Realist perspective, then, the Free Will Defense is worthless as a piece of theistic apologetic because it misrepresents God. Some call the Defense positively idolatrous.

21. God is the ultimate activator of all particular agency. However, this is easy to misunderstand and confuse with determinacy.