Consistently, the free thinkers and published writers whose opinions I tend to respect the most seem to be flocking to amoralism. They appear to be promoting that not only is God dead, but also that religion's ghost, the philosophies of morality, is fading. One of my favorite writers announced in a posthumously published book something along the lines of that morality was responsible for most of human suffering.

They amoralist free thinkers promote that having a heart, and listening to it, is enough.

Are they right?

I suspect that nearly all of human history's belief systems are B.S., morality no exception. I believe morality evolved from an instinctive social love and primitive contemplation. Take away the erroneous belief systems, and social love remains.

Yet… even if most, even if all, of the history of ethics in philosophy is in error, if one has a social sense of love, thinking about what is logical to do for one's attachments amounts to ethics, even morality.

Most people have a selfish and selfless side. The best logical ethical concern I can come up with that harmonizes individual selfishness and individual selflessness is research into and strategizing for fairness. All sentient life potentially becomes a military, so that selfish beings are protected and motivated to protect one another's interests. Social attachments usually benefit from fair treatment, little niches unifying.

And I have reason to suspect that love in its simplest form embraces the whole without reservation.

"Love, and do what thou wilt." - Aleister Crowley

Some amoralists promote that nothing can be proven, and I agree. They go further and state that philosophies are so distorted (by emotional bias, finite data out of infinite data to explore, the necessity of randomness) that any lean is irrational and that it isn't possible to "hedge one's bets." You may have already read my take on this: the Essays section essay on Probability.