

SLIDE	NOTES
1	<p><b>TITLE</b></p> <p>In this module we dive deeper into the first of the 3 main deadly virtues from duty Ethics: UNCONDITIONAL LOVE</p>
2	<p>* Love is one of the most conflicted words in the English language...</p> <p>* Dictionary.com has 28 entries listed for Love...</p> <p>* The Greeks actually had 6 different words, not just 1 like we have.</p> <p><b>Anim1:</b> Eros - Sexual Passion</p> <p><b>Anim2:</b> Philia - Deep Friendship</p> <p><b>Anim3:</b> Ludius - Playful affection</p> <p><b>Anim4:</b> Agape - Universal Brotherly Love</p> <p><b>Anim5:</b> Pragma - Longstanding love (couples married for a long time)</p> <p><b>Anim6:</b> Philautia - Love of Self (included both narcissism and self-esteem)</p> <p><b>Anim7:</b> <b>AGAPE</b> It is generally understood that when we are talking about love in a religious context, we are talking about agape, or God's universal love.</p>
3	<p><b>FALSE LOVE</b></p> <p>As you can imagine, Eternalism with its ontological perspective of God-inside-the-box, has a very different perspective of God's love compared to the opposite God-outside-the-box perspective of historical Christianity.</p> <p><b>Anim1:</b> <b>Quote</b> C.S. Lewis</p> <p><b>Anim2:</b> Comparing Divine Love to a sickness where God is a host with infinite supply, and we are dependent parasites taking advantage of the host. (Yes, this is sick)</p>
4	<p>* From the perspective of historical Christianity, this model of comparing divine love to a sickness, where parasites take advantage of the host, is also the model advocated for us mortals to follow as well.</p> <p><b>Quote</b> Mother Teresa</p> <p>* Your "Self" should be spent completely for others. We should let the people "Eat us up."</p> <p>* Notice why...Out of Duty we have no right to do otherwise.</p> <p><b>Can you imagine your Life if you implement this consistently?</b></p> <p>* Various forms of this have even incorrectly crept into Latter-day Saint thinking, causing many people to burn out and leave the Church saying "It may be true, but it is not a very happy life letting other people eat me up."</p> <p>* Only...it isn't true...and they are leaving the wrong church based on the wrong doctrine and wrong ontology.</p>
5	<p>The apostate version of Love has become all an all Powerful God in itself...The universal, unconditional, "Get-Out-Of-Jail-Free" card, taking over everything it touches, becoming a law unto itself thanks to Duty Ethics.</p> <p>* What started out as "<b>God is Love</b>" (actionable through the atonement) has become "<b>Love is God</b>"</p>
6	<p><b>Quote</b> Anders Nygren</p> <p>Apostate Christianity's Version of Divine Love is total primacy of consciousness, nothing to do with lawfulness.</p> <p><b>Anim1:</b> <b>Quote</b> With this version of love, righteousness no longer matters...No difference between worthy and unworthy ... Free grace repackaged as unconditional love.</p> <p><b>Anim2:</b> <b>Quote</b> Loves the unlovable...</p> <p><b>In that case who can you think of that is the most unlovely, unlovable person in existence? Wouldn't Satan be the most loved person of everyone?</b></p> <p><b>Anim3:</b> The issue comes down to:</p>

	<p>Does love create value (consciousness creating reality) or is love a based cause and effect of something real?</p> <p><b>Anim4:</b> Let's consider the Children's Book..."No Matter What" ... a secular portrayal of Unconditional historical Christian love.  <b>Will Large love Small forever, no matter what?</b></p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Small was feeling grim and grumpy.</p> <p><b>Anim1:</b> Small throws a tantrum and trashes a room. When Small's parent (Large) asks "what is the matter?", Small replies "I'm grim and grumpy, and I don't think you love me at all". Large simply replies, "Grumpy or not, I'll always love you no matter what."</p> <p><b>Anim2:</b> Not convinced and testing boundaries, Small asks if it were something meaner like a grizzly bear, would Large still love Small? The answer of course is "no matter what."</p> <p><b>Anim3:</b> Small again not convinced, asks if it were something grosser like a squishy bug would Large still love Small? The answer of course is "no matter what,"</p> <p><b>Anim4:</b> Small again not convinced, asks if it were something more dangerous and gross like a toothy crocodile would Large still love Small? The answer of course is "no matter what,"</p> <p><b>Anim5:</b> ...and so on. No Matter What = Unconditionally.  <b>What do you think of this story?</b></p> <p>Although the book is serious in its heartfelt sentiment portraying unconditional love, a serious analysis of its implications exposes the hidden disastrous consequences.</p> <p><b>Anim6:</b> Grumbly little Fox...Can show any bad attitude he wills. ATTITUDE DOESN'T MATTER!  <b>Anim7:</b> The little terror...Willfully trashes his room. BEHAVIOR DOESN'T MATTER!  <b>Anim8:</b> Changes his identity to something meaner. IDENTITY DOESN'T MATTER!  <b>Anim9:</b> Meanness doesn't matter so try gross-ness. IDENTITY DOESN'T MATTER!  <b>Anim10:</b> Try a combination of mean and gross...IDENTITY STILL DOESN'T MATTER!  <b>Anim11:</b> LOVED NO MATTER WHAT!</p> <p><b>Happy ending...Right?</b>          * Saying nothing matters is really the same thing as saying anything goes.          * Like most overly-sentimental stories, the book stops short in depicting the real probable outcome. So Eternalism's added a more reality based alternate ending</p> <p><b>Anim12: Alternate Ending</b>          * As if when Small figures out "nothing matters" the bad attitude, the bad behavior, the mean-ness, the gross-ness will somehow stop and it will be all hugs and kisses from then on.          * It's not hard to imagine what happens as Small becomes a teenager, and then an adult after years of growing up without any boundaries.          * No laws, no governance. Pure Willfulness from everyone who believes this nonsense.          * This is just free grace repackaged as unconditional love.</p>
<p>8</p>	<p><b>Remove You From I Love You</b>          * Most destructively of all, Small intuitively knows that when unconditional love is applied to a person, that person loses their identity. When Small tests all potential boundaries and can't find any, Small is rightly confused.          * "I Love You" for "Large" and "Small"...Turned into "I Love Y &lt;insert whatever here&gt;"...          * Unconditional Love apparently has nothing to do with Small. In the end Small is gone and he knows it. Small knows he is losing his identity, and fighting desperately to keep it somehow.</p> <p><b>Mother Teresa</b>  <b>Anim1: Quote</b> Mother Teresa...</p>

	<p>* True Love must destroy yourself (self-sacrifice)          * Love must hurt. Love must be painful.  <b>Anim2:</b> What started out with "I Love You!"  <b>Anim3:</b> Now becomes "(X) Loves You!". You must remove "I" from the equation. There is no "I" anymore because you must self-sacrifice yourself.  <b>Anim4:</b> But wait! It isn't really about the other person either. Saint and Sinner, Worthy and Unworthy are Loved exactly the same. It now becomes "(X) Loves (Y)."  <b>Anim5:</b> This is still not enough. This version of false love must give until it hurts. The more pain you feel out of Duty, the more they call it Love. It now becomes "(X) Dutifully Sacrifices Itself For (Y)." Which isn't really Love anymore is it?</p> <p><b>Do you see how this corrupt version of Love just destroyed everything?</b></p> <p>* There is no "I" anymore because "I" self-sacrificed.          * There is no "You" anymore because it has nothing to do with any attribute you may or may not possess.          * There is no Love anymore. What was once called Love is now called "Pain" inflicted out of Duty.</p> <p><b>Anim6:</b> Quote Joseph Fielding McConkie  <b>Anim7:</b> Quote Elder Packer</p>
9	<p><b>ACTIONABLE, PROPRTIONAL LOVE</b>  <b>Quote</b> Shakespeare ... Divine love is a verb, proportional to the actions taken.</p> <p><b>Anim1:</b> Gospel Mark Chart          The Gospel target is proportional Love...Love according to Law...Proportional to the commandments that are kept  <b>Quote</b> John 14:15 ... Notice the conditional IF</p> <p><b>What would be the undershooting version?</b></p> <p><b>Anim2:</b> Bad Love: Love of Money, Love of Lies, Love of Wickedness. Destroys everything it touches.  <b>Anim3:</b> Unconditional Love: Evil gets a free pass with unconditional Love...Also destroys everything it touches.</p>
10	<p><b>CONDITIONAL LOVE</b>          The Restoration and true modern prophets have taught about the conditional nature of LOVE and the absolute nature of LAW.  <b>Quote</b> Elder Nelson          Conditional nature of Love and absolute nature of Law upheld by the restoration.</p> <p><b>Quote</b> Elder Oaks          People (including Satan) want to corrupt Divine Love into a "get-out-of-jail-free" card for any willful behavior they feel like.</p>
11	<p><b>Tree of Life (Is Conditional)</b>  <b>Quote</b> Elder Bednar          * Notice the conditional nature of the love of God represented by the tree of life.          * The actionable blessings of the atonement represented by the fruit on the tree, are only conditionally gained by those who follow the path, clinging to the iron rod, and enduring to the end.          * The fruit is not available in vending machines in the lobby of the great and spacious building. * Nor are there street vendors peddling the fruit all along the path.          * It can't be found strewn about everywhere in the mists of darkness for people to stumble over and pick up.          * The fruit is only conditionally available to those who do the work to walk the path, stay on the path, and arrive at the tree to gather the fruit for themselves.</p> <p><b>Anim1:</b> Quote Elder Christofferson</p>

	<p><b>Anim2: Quote</b> Alma 43:13</p> <p><b>Anim3: Quote</b> D&amp;C 138:3-4</p> <p>* God's Love, is based on our receiving the conditions of the atonement...His arms are always outstretched seeking out to us (manifested through the infinite atonement) but it doesn't have any affect (actionable) unless the terms are accepted and the conditions complied with.</p> <p>* These are the actionable blessings of the atonement <i>conditionally</i> gained by following the path, clinging to the iron rod, enduring to the end.</p>
12	<p><b>What do you think it means to Love your Enemies?</b></p> <p><b>Anim1: Quote</b> Matthew 5:44</p> <p>Our perspective on how we interpret loving our enemies will depend on which ontology we are coming from (absolute or conditional)</p> <p><b>President Brigham Young</b> passed through the mob violence of Kirtland, Missouri, and Nauvoo. He had first-hand, practical experience in dealing with enemies of the most violent nature. Consequently, he understood the mistaken misapplication of this teaching common to historical Christianity.</p> <p><b>Anim2: Quote</b> Brigham Young.</p> <p><b>Anim3: Quote</b> Brigham Young...Don't invite wickedness into your life. Place the enemies where they would not hurt anybody...take "special care" of how you "do good to them" in order to reclaim them, but not to supply them in their evil ways, and destroy your own life in the process.</p>
13	<p><b>Quote</b> President Joseph F. Smith</p> <p><b>Anim1: Quote</b> Brigham Young</p> <p><b>Anim2: Quote</b> Brigham Young.</p>
14	<p><b>Doesn't loving friends and family differently than enemies require judgment on our part?</b></p> <p><b>Are we commanded not to judge?</b></p> <p>Consider the following scripture from both a duty ethics perspective and a value ethics perspective.</p> <p><b>Anim1: Quote</b> Matthew 7:1</p> <p><b>Is the Lord is telling us to turn off our brains and ignore realities?</b></p> <p><b>Anim2: Quote</b> Matthew 7:1 ... Notice this is exactly as Joseph Smith translated Matt. 7:1 ... Commanding us to judge correct judgement... But still many Latter-day Saints misquote it as well as misinterpret it.</p> <p>Those who misinterpret Matthew 7:1, run with it out of context while ignoring additional evidence in the rest of the sermon where Christ said:</p> <p><b>Anim3: Quote</b> Matthew 7:6</p> <p><b>Anim4: Quote</b> Matthew 7:15-16</p> <p>* The obvious question arising from the apparent contradiction between Matthew 7:1 and the rest of the sermon is:</p> <p><b>How can you determine dogs and swine, sheep and wolves unless you use your brain to judge?</b></p> <p><b>Can you separate the fruit from the tree?</b></p> <p>* The obvious answer is you can't.</p> <p>* The Book of Mormon adds much needed clarification. The Book of Mormon describes how not only are we COMMANDED to judge, we are also told how to do it, and how it is quite simply done.</p> <p><b>Anim5: Quote</b> Moroni 7:15-16</p>
15	<p><b>Quote</b> Elder Oaks</p> <p>Discussed this contradiction, explaining the definition problem with the word "Judge"</p> <p>CONDEMNATION = Final Judgement</p> <p>REASON = Intermediate Judgement</p>

**Anim1:** **Quote** Elder Oaks... **Final Judgment** by mortals, doesn't make sense because "the race" is not over yet.

**Anim2:** **Quote** Elder Oaks... **Intermediate Judgements** of people (using our reason) are actually required in order to protect ourselves in life.

**Anim3:** **Quote** Elder Jeffrey R. Holland

- \* Satan has a hey-day with these two "get-out-of-jail-free" scriptures (no judging, and loving enemies).
- \* With the false perspective of "don't judge no matter what", evil has its bad behavior ignored.
- \* Combined with the false perspective of "love no matter what", evil is actually aided in its wickedness.
- \* This Duty Ethics is where you then become held hostage by your own values, because Duty has nothing to do with your values.

16

Questions? Rating?