

## BLASPHEMY OF SOLVING AND "SOLVING" THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

To say there is no God because of evil is to admit that if there is a God and you are wrong that he is evil and filthy. It does not make sense to blame the creator and refuse to blame those who create the creator! If there is no God, then God is an idea invented by religious people collectively.

The answer they choose for the problem of evil says a lot about them. The basic answer is that free will is so important that it is worth God letting you torment the whole world to death. That is not theology but arrogance and pride - who do you think you are with your free will? If there is free will to be able to love then God undermines the love so it is absurd to say he gives it as a gift or that he can be good and give you that! If free will is just a faculty we have and that is a brute fact then there is no room for such arrogance.

Bad by definition means unacceptable. Good by definition means acceptable. Humanists and those who think like them would say acceptable means what is acceptable to the healthy minded person. Believers say it is what is acceptable to God that matters. God then is a hindrance to real morality.

Moralists would change unacceptable or acceptable to mean morally unacceptable or morally acceptable. But the fact remains that not all good is moral. It is good for a flower to grow but that has nothing to do with morality. In fact without good that just happens there can be no possibility of developing a moral perspective. Good then matters and moral good does not if there has to be a choice between one or the other. Indeed the latter cannot exist if you reject the first anyway. To reject the first is to reject the second but to reject the second is not to reject the first.

So if you hurt a baby for nothing then it is more important that it is unacceptable than that it is morally unacceptable. When morality which is about rewards and punishment and what you deserve it is clear that the person who just spontaneously helps the baby is better than the one who does it for it is the moral thing. The distinction can look like splitting hairs but in fact the former person soars above the latter as high as Everest above the deepest hole on earth.

Evil is so despicable that it is right to assume that it is totally incompatible with goodness even if it could be understood in less stark terms. It is evil to disagree. Believers could say that evil fits God but allow some exceptions but they do not. If it is bad to say evil fits God it is just worse and callous even to say there are no evils that refute and make God impossible. To truly honour a God involves seeing him as the being who cannot bear evil.

The argument from evil is usually seen as an argument against God and the most destructive one but it can be seen as an argument that respects the God idea so much that it refuses to say he in any sense uses or is okay with evil. If God could be honoured by being denied it would deny him for that reason.

There is no contradiction in saying that because of evil belief in God is a bad thing but it is a pity there cannot be a God so the belief in that sense demands respect. It would be the same saying we respect the belief that there should be no aging and dying but disrespect how in our circumstances it would do more than harm.

The theologian might nod to "You respect the idea of God and then "progress" to respecting God. Atheists might be the only ones who respect God after all!"

### **Hypothetically: Is it better to believe in evil or not?**

We have to believe in evil for it is real. But is having to believe an evil? If it is then it is a necessary evil.

If it is not better to believe, then does God imply we should believe and are better off believing?

This is what is going on inside the believer, "To find evil justifiable I need exceptionally good evidence otherwise I become evil for it is evil to take evil lightly. I degrade myself and the innocent suffering of billions. If I say there is a God I mean that humanity should be given the freedom to torment babies to death and that he is right to make terrible viruses which will afflict people. I agree with him so I share in his responsibility for evil. I should not believe lightly or without very strong evidence for God. But who cares about the evidence right? No I want to believe and that is what really matters."

If that view goes with believing in God then God cannot be truly a God who wants you to love your neighbour. Religion says love is sacrificing for the good of another. If God is always doing what is best for us then even our sins somehow can be for the best thus there is no such thing as sacrificing goods for the greater goods. Religion lies that it really cares about

good quality love that helps others and wants and needs nothing back. God is a block to such love.

The argument that evil is a mystery and its God who condemns it claims that is enough to show that evil and an all-powerful God of love can agree. It is not. There are things done for reasons we cannot think of or have not thought of but that is not one of them. If it is then the nation that kills babies for no apparent reason might have a justification after all. It would not be as bad to condone the nation for it still does less harm than God!

## TAKE WHAT YOU GIVE

Judging means really suggesting that the person is good or bad or in-between. With God, people just say he is good and leave the judging out. That is bias. A God who judges us should be judged himself. That means being prepared to call him evil and to condemn those who worship him. It is evil and unfair to take any other approach. This is more than a problem of evil - its a contradiction. Religion calls evil a problem when it may be more than that and that is evil and is intended to invite and induce bias.