

WHY IS IT NOT ENOUGH FOR A BELIEVER TO THINK THAT GOOD IS JUST GOOD

The Bible says that God is love but though God is somehow abstract love he is more than that as well. You cannot use the doctrine to argue that anybody that loves is in touch with God. There are no grounds for redefining God as just love. God in the Bible is not an attribute but a personal being who has attributes.

The notion that there is no genuine belief in morality unless you believe it is a person, God, actually contradicts the notion that moral principles are about persons. Maths can be made about us. But it does not follow that you have to believe maths is a person. In fact believing that would only make maths look ridiculous. So it is with this morality that is God.

Fusing God and morality is just a crafty underhand way of saying that there is nothing morally wrong with anything that God might do when God thoroughly approves of what he does. So God's approval is what makes something right in moral terms.

Morality puts obedience before love. Even it commands love it follows that the faculty to command matters more than love. Commanding is better than love for it makes love matter and promotes love. Obedience to God is seen as more important than love for God. In that light, the notion of morality being God is far from endearing. It masks the notion that morality is not real and thus needs a God to make it real. It masks the insane notion that morality is not something that is right even if God thinks it is wrong. Only God makes it right.

How important then is obedience to God and the loving of God? It is more important. But by how much? 99%? 1%? If there is no love unless it is commanded and made a moral law and love is good then it could be that obedience is 99%. We have to assume it is. It is the safer choice. If God is love then God is commander before he is love so to love God means love his being commander more than anything. So it seems we don't need to assume. If God exists then obedience is 99 and love is 1.

Why is it not enough for people that goodness exists and simply cannot not exist? Even if there were nothing at all it would be good that there is nobody around to suffer. Why do they want goodness to be a God? Is it because they think he can change goodness for them? Even if they settle into a model of moral goodness is it because they think it is not definite? A moral code being changeable does not mean you really want it to change and you can be happy that you can change it if you want even if you never will. It is still made to be about pleasing you in that sense as opposed to being truly good. People fear facts for they cannot be changed no matter what. Their egos love the thought that they have embraced God's morals that God has invented and it makes them feel they have power even over morality for they are complicit with God. If you create the law that kindness is good you are selfish for you are following your idol. But if kindness is right and law no matter what you are anybody else thinks you have to comply and it feels like bondage. Then being kind is a true sacrifice and can be done with respect for virtue.

Morality, according to some, feels like it came from someone not something. But that is only a feeling. A computer making laws for us and judging us would do just fine. You cannot build morality on the shifting sand of a mere feeling that may not be there tomorrow. Trying to make morality out to be God the person is doomed to failure. It does not work and is of no practical use. It does not save believers from arbitrary moral rules. It creates harm and adores harmful principles and hypocrisy.

Instinct

Believers in God and atheists both react by instinct when somebody suffers needlessly. Their instinct tells them to try to fix the problem. The believer in God pretends it is about God. The unbeliever admits it is instinct.

The believer who admits the role of instinct still claims that he does it because God commands it. But that means morality is not all about God at all. Surely it could work just fine then without him?

Proof/evidence

Concern for evidence and proof go with justice. Period. Yet there are those who say that God somehow is love and justice and then say it does not matter if he cannot be proved or reasonably validated. They need to make up their minds. They are really saying love and justice cannot be proved either or matter more than God for they can be proven true and he cannot. A God who is justice who proves justice to us but not himself is a strange odd God. Those who say proof or good evidence for God does not matter are just trotting out an excuse for why there is no evidence or proof. And in the process they make a

laughing stock of morality. The fact that Christianity has big standards that few live up to if anybody could be explained by saying the religion is not the friend of morality it thinks it is.

Real goodness is not about being pressured by an obligation moral or otherwise. It is spontaneous. Is it good to help a baby because you believe it's a moral rule? No. It is better to just help the baby without caring about a rule. Goodness is passive in that sense.

There cannot be an obligation to be obligated. If a law obligates you it does not need another law to make it obligate you. Morality is about controlling people but not changing their hearts. A God who is justice and love then is a violation of our dignity.

Finally

We may say we get our good from God but there are problems with evidence and why God should be classed as good. We still end up deciding what good is so God in a sense is a mental construct. We are opposing morality by using tricks such as God to represent and stand for it.