

27.05.2022



Freedom.

FREEDOM ... It is as inspiring as a raised and developing flag.

Usually, the concept of Freedom is associated with «the ability to do what you want without hindrance». It seems to me, however, more important to ponder this question: «Does Man have freedom of choice? ».

How does Sponville's Dictionary of Philosophy, for example, interpret the concept of Freedom?

Three main senses of the concept are distinguished: Freedom of action ... Freedom of desire ... Freedom of thought ... But, is it Freedom of thought? To begin with, I would line them up in logical order. First a thought arises. As its consequence, a desire arises, and in its fulfillment, an action.

André Comte-Sponville associates Man's *freedom of action*, in the political sense, with the state, which is the main restrictor of freedom of action. And indeed, as long as Man does not encounter another Man (and in the general case another Being) on his way, he seems to have freedom of action. It is appropriate to quote Schopenhauer's statement «Man is free only when he is alone». As soon as a minimal group of people is formed and they agree to live together, this is the end of the freedom of action of each member of the formed community - a mini state. Because a separate person is forced to connect his / her actions with actions of the community members and with the following rules of the community. The measure of «freedom of members of society, according to Holbach, must be the good of society as a whole». I find this statement rather dubious. As well as his assertion that «freedom is the ability to do anything for one's own happiness that does not harm the happiness of other members of society». This has more to do with ethical norms of behavior in society, but not with the concept of Freedom.

A person living in a community of his likes is forced to accept the laws of this community (state), and his freedom of action must be fully regulated by the laws of the state. Formally, the more completely the laws acting in a state take into account Man's individual freedom of action, respect human dignity (and not only as a Citizen of his country), the more comfortable and freer is the life of each of its members. Thus, the Person and measure of the freedom of action of any State is its Constitution, the basic body of Laws.

Reading the constitutions of the countries of Western Europe, one is struck by the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany, where in the first Article, paragraph 1, states: «Human dignity is inviolable. To respect it is the duty of the entire State power». The Constitutions of Portugal, the Netherlands and Finland are also very similar in this respect. If the executive system of the State works well, the citizens of these countries should have the greatest freedom of action.

Since we have already built a logical sequence of the main concepts of Freedom according to Sponville, let's move on to the first in order - freedom of *thought*. And what is this?

In Sponville's reasoning there seems to me to be a little confusion ... Freedom of thought. Freedom of the mind. The freedom of the mind. The free necessity of truth. These notions must be dealt with. As Sartre said, «... History is moving slowly toward the realization of man by man...».

As we have accepted in earlier discussions, Truth is a set of coherent mental images. And mental images are the essence of thoughts (structured quanta of information) and are in no way a product of the Human brain but a natural product of the Creator's Creation act and a part of Him. If atomic and molecular matter of the brain cannot provide thinking but performs only neurophysiological functions for organs in the form of a regulatory and communication network, then what FREEDOM of thinking / mind / mind can we talk about? Spinoza was right when he said: «Everything in this world follows from a rigid logical necessity, and people are deluded into thinking they are free. This opinion is based only on the fact that they are conscious of their actions; the *reasons* by which they are determined do *not know*.» (Benedict Spinoza, The Ethics, Part 2, Theorem 35, Scholia. Vol. 1, p. 316)

When the Creator reveals a mental image (Thought) to you at a strictly defined moment in your life, are you free to realize it?

Perhaps, it has happened to everyone - a very important, ingenious thought *came* to you and you began to understand many hitherto incomprehensible processes! You think - it is impossible to forget such an important thought and you do not write it down... And what happens next? You forget the thought and nothing else helps you to remember it! Is the human being free in the awareness of the thought given to him, or is he not free in this too? I am still not sure, but I admit that the freedom to realize the thoughts that have come may be the only freedom given by the Creator, because the realization of thoughts is the only possibility to improve the Soul and to cognize the Creator.

What else can I add?

The closest to my understanding of the term Freedom are the positions of the Orphics and Stoics.

The Orphics believe that Man will never be free while alive, but will gain freedom only after death, when the Soul appears before the Creator. The essence of the Orphic doctrine is well seen from the following thesis: «From man you are reborn into God». It means that the time will come and you will be reborn from a human being into a divine (incorporeal) one.

The Stoics adhere to the principle that one should take the «blows of fate» with equanimity, since Man cannot influence it. One should only improve one's «spiritual world».

We can agree with both positions with a few amendments :)