

Decision-Theoretic Proof of God, Escape from Freedom, and Total Internalization of Relations of Power

—**Decision-Theoretic Proof of God**— Dostoevsky's Ivan Karamazov: If there is no God everything is permitted. The verdict from phenomenology of decision is that permissibility and utility of a choice are spectacularly coordinated—Reason internalism defended by Bernard Williams is the claim that permissibility of an action equals its utility—. That the instant of decision is madness (Kierkegaard) means one finds facing every real decision frightening. Every choice one makes is a step towards becoming something one is not yet rather than another thing one is not yet either. [Heidegger: "Dasein always understands itself in terms of possibilities" and "the primary thing that is revealed with resoluteness is Dasein"]. If one is to undergo decision making one has to find one choice more preferable than others. Because of their difference in utility One does not find every choice equally permitted. One's God is that which matters most crucially for one's decision. —**Example of Cruciality**— Zizek: Our post-modern reflexive society which seems hedonistic and permissive is actually saturated with rules and regulations which are intended to serve all well-being (restriction on smoking and eating, rules against sexual harassment).

— **Well-being** — Dostoevsky's Ivan Karamazov's Grand inquisitor [to Christ]: "You wanted to come into the world and You came empty-handed, with nothing but some vague promise of freedom which in their simple-mindedness and innate irresponsibility, men cannot conceive and which they fear and dread, for there has never been anything more difficult for man to bear than freedom. Turn the stones in the barren desert to into loaves of bread and men will follow You like cattle, grateful and docile, ... But you did not want to deprive man of freedom and you rejected this suggestion, for, You thought, what sort of freedom would they have if their obedience was bought by bread? You replied that man does not live by bread alone. ... man has no more agonizing need than the need to find someone to to whom he can hand over the gift of freedom ... But only one who can appease a man's conscious can take his freedom from him ... even if there is nothing more indisputable than bread ... For the mystery of human existence lies not in just staying alive but in finding something to live for."

— **The Leap of Faith** according to Kierkegaard "becomes easier in the degrees to which some distance intervenes between the initial position and the place the leap takes off. And so it is also with respect to a decisive moment in the realm of spirit. The most difficult decisive is not that in which the individual is far removed from the decision but when it is as if the matter were already decided. Suppose that Jacobi (German Philosopher) himself has made the leap; suppose that with the aid of eloquence he manages to persuade a learner to to want to do it. Then the learner has direct relation to Jacobi and consequently does not himself come to make the leap. The direct relation is naturally much easier."— Freedom **for** not **of** submission.

—**Internalization of Relation of Power**— a case in history: The Iranian Tobacco Protest was a Shia revolt in Qajar Iran against an 1890 tobacco concession granted by the Qajar Emperor then to the British Empire, granting control over growth, sale, and export of tobacco. As the Shia leader Mirzaye Shirazi issued a verdict to the public against the usage of tobacco leading to its cancellation. Shirazi had no military structure or sophisticated propaganda machine in his disposal in order to bar his followers from the pleasure of intoxication. Shirazi (or Jacobi) accepts the burden of freedom that is too frightening for others to accept.

—**Possibility of Freedom**— There are cases of freedom-of but its ultimate form and realization is perpetually elusive. Perhaps freedom-of is a myth if freedom-of is effectively entrapment in one's desire and wishfulness if not that of others (social-cultural construction of desire, reason, permissibility). Perhaps paradoxically freedom-from has a better chance of actuality.—Those who are not slaves but play the role of slaves like the liberated slaves pretending to be slaves in Herman Melville's *Benito Cereno*. They are free for that to which they submit—preserving their freedom.

Religion is the opium of people; did Marx intend to insult religion more or opium more? Because they are exquisite gifts of nature and history replaced in modern times by anti-depressants and alienation.