

Is there a duty to expose wrongdoing?

Human nature favours the person who lets evil happen over the person who directly does the evil. The wife who lets her husband beat the children will be more favoured in society and by more people than her husband will be. Believers take advantage of this irrational quirk to foist belief in God on the unwary and on those who should know better. Evil is disorder and it disguises itself as good and attractive. Thus the being that lets it happen, is consenting to the lack of control it implies. This being is worse than the person who does evil because the doer of the evil imposes some control over it and can stop it. A God who does evil would be hugely superior to the one that merely allows it to happen. An evil you do has more control imposed on it than an evil you allow and it will be a specific kind of evil. The murderer of the woman might not murder a baby. Allowing evil means you are willing literally anything to happen. The intention is far more evil.

The rule is that nothing should ever be done that may be harmful. If religion or a religious may do harm, it should be abandoned. Nobody must suffer or be hurt over religious faith. This principle has some implications. If you are going to condone evil that is done by a God, you should then be far more keen on condoning evil that is done by a human person.

Expose wrongdoing so that it may be stopped, and if not stopped then at least it is exposed and can be prevented in the future. The wrongdoer cannot accuse you of doing wrong by exposing him - he should be worried about his own evil not the evil he imputes to you.