

If there is a supreme intelligence, should we assume by default that he or it is good?

Suppose you show there is a supreme intelligence that made all things. The question then arises is what the default view of him or it should be.

The default is the view or position that it alone is reasonable to take. For example, if you find water on your landing and there is a hole above it in the ceiling the default is that there is a leak not that somebody put the water there. If a view is the default there is a less likely position that would become the default should we have the wrong default. The default we must choose is the number one in the chart and there are runners up.

It is up to the believers to prove that this intelligence is good. They need to have a reason for trying to do this. There is no point in just saying the intelligence is good - learn what good is first. Then God will mean something to you if you find out he exists and is good.

We are not talking about whether the intelligence exists or not, but about what it is.

The biggest default position will be lack of belief in the supreme intelligence being good, bad or whatever. Disbelief is going further than mere lack of belief. It cannot be the default.

The default then is saying that it is not known if the intelligence is amoral or immoral or good. We start with a kind of agnosticism about if it can be known to be moral, amoral or good.

The biggest default is the one we have to go with. The default means the only reasonable option.

The second biggest default position is belief that the intelligence is amoral in the sense of cannot think in terms of right and wrong.

The third biggest default position is that the intelligence is amoral in the sense that it doesn't (not cannot) think in terms of right and wrong. Amorality is the second and third for it is fairer and more realistic to suspect the being of being amoral rather than bad and it is easier for a being to be amoral than bad.

The fourth biggest default position is that it is probably immoral or probably good or probably morally neutral (neutral means it is as bad as it is good or vice versa). [With this one there are sub-defaults. If you cannot prove if it is immoral or moral then you have to assume it is neither or both. That is to say you assume it is morally neutral. To assume it is good or bad is evil for it is choosing the wrong default.]

The sixth that it is **very** probably immoral or good or morally neutral. [Again the morally neutral is the default option].

The seventh that it is **provably** immoral or good or morally neutral. [Again the morally neutral is the default option].

Going through all the list shows that God's goodness cannot be a default or even likely.

The intelligence is not entitled to be described as God unless he is good. God means a good being.

Our examination of the defaults in their correct order show that people have to try so hard to defend belief in an all-good God that they end up looking and being desperate. Their belief is low in the ranking as a default. It does not count for it is so low!

Be an atheist and keep it simple and you won't find yourself looking for a belief that condones the suffering of others. If you believe in God you have to say he is right to let nature be so cruel and indeed that he was right to make it as bad as it is. If it were easy to believe in God the condoning would be less bad. But when they have to struggle and come up with excuse after excuse for believing in God, the condoning is just repulsive.

The defaults show it is inherently unlikely for the supreme intelligence to be good. Therefore it is inherently irrational to believe in a good God.

If you punch a child for fun, it is not just about what God says or how God is offended. What about the harm? That must be important too! If the harm matters at all, it matters whether there is a God or not. That proves that morality is default. It cannot be avoided and the amoral person really has a morality after all. It just does not look or act very moral but it is an

attempt at morality. Morality is a default and it is default without God. Therefore God cannot be the ground of morality.

Morality is a human relationships default not a religious or God-related default.

Free will casts light on what we should take as the default position regarding God

If you believe in a loving God then you will believe free will is about choosing to be loving like God or not. God gave it so that you could really love for love is voluntary.

Think about if we are to be good or bad or neutral. One of these and only one is the default. What is the default? Good? Evil? Neither – which is the same as both together as equals? The last option is neutral. If neutrality is the default then free will is not really about choosing between evil and good. It is able to choose one of them but is not about them. Thus free will if it exists would prove there is no God. If free will were meant to be used for evil then that would disprove God too. Good gets one score and non-good in both its forms outnumber it. So the default is clearly not good.