

# Slave and Free

by

Philip McPherson Rudisill

Inspired by Chris Hedges' books on religious and atheist fundamentalism, namely:

[American Fascism](#) and [I Don't Believe In Atheists](#).

12/21/2008

Revised 1/14/2016 and Edited 2/5/2017

## Abstract

The author here identifies most religious and all atheist movements as essentially willing to undertake and promote immoral actions, and as exemplifying this currently by rejecting the principle of the equal rights for all people. In contrast the one hope for a decent world lies in a religious movement which is dedicated to morally right actions above self interest, and accordingly supports equal rights for all people.

## Slave and Freeman

I want to divide humans into two groups, one of which I call Slave and the other Free.

### Slave

The Slave takes external dictation for all things, including what is moral and what is immoral.\*

\* The religious slave, if he wishes to think of himself as moral, must identify "moral" with "command of God", and in that way is able to continue in his moral delusion. Thus no moral preconditions are assumed, and what is moral is abstracted from the commands of God. A usual justification of immoralities of God is that faith and patience are needed until the final day when everything will be made clear, and where all will see that what was immoral to our eye was actually moral.\*\* \*\*\* \*\*\*\*\*

\*\* Kant would note that such a principle means the death knell of the moral in a practical sense, for then all things would be lawful and a legitimate choice, and moral judgments would be futile and thus inane.

\*\*\* This axiom that all the commands of God will be moral proves that morality in fact precedes the commands of God, for otherwise, for example, if God commands the slaughter of innocents, no question as to any ultimate morality would ever arise to question that.

\*\*\*\* This “patience” is expressly the case in the Islamic "Instruction of Young Moses", Quran ([Sura 18:60-82](#)).

I think you can find many Slaves among the Southern Baptists\*, the Roman Catholics, the Mormons and the Muslims, to mention a few. Here, as a common factor, we have an divine authority giving orders (Bible, Pope, Prophet, etc.) and these commands are called “moral”.\*\*

\* See [Baptist Thinking](#).

\*\* A good example justifying the quotation marks here around "moral" is given by Kant, namely: the Muslim is required to give to the poor, but this is not a moral act because the motivation is reward via obedience, and the act is undertaken with the same submissive frame of mind as when the Muslim bows down according to clock and compass; this makes the subjugation of independence clear and embarrassing to Freeman. It is no more moral than paying taxes demanded by a government under threat of punishment. Kant called it extortion.\*\*\* It is essentially a commercial transactions, i.e., acting for the sake of reward or to avoid punishment, and thus has nothing to do with any moral.

\*\*\* See also the essay on the [Sagan and Kant](#) for a consideration of the confusion of the moral and the prudent.

I want to justify this ascription of submissive mentality to these groups by means of an example. It is self-evident that the moral law calls for the equal treatment and valuation of all people. Now in contrast it is by virtue of a “divine communication” that Slaves are willing to violate this moral law and deny equal rights to homosexuals (and there is a thought in at least one of the groups [Muslims] to do the same to those who prefer eating with the left-hand). Ordinarily such action would be called immoral; but since this is considered by these groups to be the will and command of God with respect to homosexuals (and to left-handers among Muslims), these actions are lauded as moral and right. Some justify God’s command by citing great difficulties for society were homosexual marriage permitted. But this justification is not considered necessary once it is clearly understood that God condemns the activities of such people. Thus by virtue of an alleged (and strongly believed) communication of God these groups will commit an immoral act . . . and call it moral.

All of these groups mentioned subscribe to this logic, i.e., the Authority of the group's thinking and action, e.g., "the Bible, says thus and thus is to be done; I believe the Bible is literal truth, and that settles it, and I am going to do as I am told.\* Accordingly they fit the profile of a Slave.

\* Kant brings up an interesting notion when speaking of the conscience, which is counted as an awareness of having fully considered an action properly and thoroughly with regard to its morality, to wit: I can never be sure of a sighting or hearing of the Divine (for it might be, I suggest, either an hallucination or demonically produced), but I am sure of the moral law, and so obviously in cases of a conflict, I will defer to the moral law and assume there is a problem in rightly communicating God's word in such a case. See essay on Kant's [Condemnation of Abraham](#). [Kant goes further and argues in his [Religion Within The Bounds Of Bare Reason](#) that given human error it can never be certain that God has commanded as it might be alleged by someone, and since what is right and wrong is certain, all humans must take the certain route and always understand God in a way that is never wrong or immoral.]

## Freeman

Now we turn our attention to the Freeman, and conceive of him as someone who acts independently of external dictation entirely (although often seeking information [but not commands] from experts, e.g., physicians) and acts according to principles which he himself selects and determines.

There are two sorts of Freeman and the distinction between them has to do with religion. There is the Free Atheist and there is the Free Believer.

**Free Atheist.** The Free Atheist chooses to use science, reason and personal inclination as his guide for action, and he rejects Kant's "moral proof" of God and denies the existence God and then, when he is consistent with himself, he also denies morality and likens a bad conscience to an illness which needs treatment.\* \*\*

\* Most atheist do not follow their denials of God to their logical conclusion. Essentially it is this: if there is no God then all things are lawful (ascribed to [Dostoyevsky](#)). The reason for this lack of total consistency is that the atheist is often so culturally conditioned that he cannot bear the thought of the suffering of people, and instead of getting medical relief from his "bad conscience" (as reason, given the rejection of morality, would advise in cases involving profit for himself), he continues in his same old mode of emotionally caring about others and thus wastes money and peace of mind on relieving the misfortunes of others. See short treatment on this in the essay [Kant and Sagan](#).

\*\* I wonder if there is perhaps a Slave Atheist, e.g., the Nazi or Communist, who discards morality entirely and depends upon a Führer/Boss to tell him what is moral and not. He then would be looking upon a human (Hitler, Stalin, Mao, etc.) as the religious slaves look upon God, the source of all legitimate authority.

And here suddenly and perhaps unexpectedly we find the Free Atheist and Slave Man to be of one coin morally speaking, i.e., the moral law is essentially dismissed and replaced in the mind of the Slave Man by the communications from God, and in the mind of the Free Atheist by blatant self interest.

Consequently, with regard to the question of universal rights, the Free Atheist might very well promote homosexual marriages, or he might want to ban such. It would depend upon his personal interests\*, for in a very real sense he is totally free of even the restraint and motivation of the moral law, and able to follow his own interest alone.

\* Perhaps he enjoys having someone to hate. Or perhaps he would enjoy tormenting a fundamentalist Christian society by promoting homosexual rights and marriage.

**Free Believer.** Finally we come to the Free Believer. This is a product of the [Council of Jerusalem](#) in the first half of the 1st century (Acts 15). This first Free Believer, the Free Christian, is free of all ecclesiastical and scriptural law.\* He is even free of gainful motivation, and counts himself already in the Kingdom of God.\*\* Accordingly he undertakes his moral and loving deeds as a reflection of his new, loving disposition and without calculation as to profit (reward or punishment). He has chosen for himself the rule of Universal Neighborly Love (as a practical proxy for the moral law) and determines all his actions in light of that rule and he looks for no external instruction (but only, again, for the aid of specialists in the sciences and arts of human nurture to further his understanding of what is a specific loving act, i.e., what is hurtful and what is helpful to human personality). As a result of this rule, he seeks to develop into a model spouse, parent, employer, employee, citizen, etc. The Free Believer will, of course, support universal rights and thus gay marriage.

\* The logic of this can be found in an essay on the [Liberty of Gentile Christian](#).

\*\* This is to be understood as already having the reward in hand, i.e., eternal life.

## Conclusion

In conclusion then we have the (religious) Slave Man allied with the Free Atheist as one in subjugating the moral law to other interests, and as opposed to the Free Believer who makes the moral law (the law of universal neighborly love for the Free Christian) supreme in all actions.

## Appendix

As a more specific example of this Free Believer I cite the Free Wesleyan movement within Christianity. Here we are dealing with a person who no longer acts for pay or reward, e.g., for a ticket to heaven, and who considers that he (or she) already has the reward in hand, i.e., eternal life with Jesus, such that all good acts are undertaken as the *consequences* of this reward already gained, this eternal life, and not undertaken in pursuit of that.

And so here we have a stark contrast with all the slave groups. The Southern Baptist, for example, engages in a calculus to determine if the reward lost through a sin is worth the gain of the sin. Eternal life is his,\* but in the future, and presently the believer, as a Southern Baptist, is engaged in finding the optimum trade off of sin now and consequence later (and some rewards can be obtained even in earthly life). Thus the Southern Baptist might be considered as the epitome of the slave, for while both he and the Free Wesleyan might have converted in order to avoid the fires of hell, and while both have since lost their fear of hell, the Baptist expects his transformation later (and thus does not look for it expectantly now) while the Wesleyan maintains it has already taken place (the New Birth) and can, with experience, point to examples of an improvement in moral sentiment and can often attest that such behavior is also getting easier. He often says: while I am far from perfection (in love), I am not as far as once I was; and I am on the way.

\* This is the so-called “[eternal security](#)”. When the Baptist sincerely accepts Jesus as Lord and Savior then no matter how sinful he may be in the future, he is guaranteed a “mansion” in heaven forever. He will have to pay for new sins with a reduced happiness now or in heaven, but he cannot avoid going to heaven no matter what he does.

The Southern Baptist (here so conceived) remains always a hireling, and thus the most abject of slaves, for he has become and remains a slave for personal gain. He searches out the “moral” in scripture, identifies it with whatever has been reported

to have been of God, and complies with the understood will of God as best he can ... and in accordance with his calculus (as to the advantage of compliance).\* The Free Wesleyan, also as conceived here, discards any calculus (except for the measure of expediency in the application of the rule of love).\*\*

\* He has to calculate whether the pain/punishment of some non-compliance with the commands of God will be more or less than that of compliance.

\*\* John Wesley, the founder of the Methodist movement, said: "I am saved from the fear, though the not possibility, of a fall from grace" (a return to a sinful live and loss of salvation).

In addition to the absence of gainful motivation in the Free Wesleyans we can attach to them also the liberty of the gentile Christian (Acts 15) where the moral law (for them the rule of universal neighborly and fraternal love) is the single determination of good and evil ([John 5:1-18](#)) and where all utterances of God must be measured with regard to moral interpretation.

And so we have here an example of a Free Believer, who does not hire himself out as a slave for gain and does not subject the moral law to the literal understanding of God's words, but rather acts according to his own principle (of the moral [universal love] above all) assumed at the moment of conversion and the New Birth.