

THE FORCE FIELD ARGUMENT AGAINST GOD - WE SHOULD BE PROTECTED FROM EVIL BY A FORCE FIELD

Religion says that God is all-good and creates all and creates only good but we still see natural evils such as diseases and earthquakes happening. They seem to think God is right to do so.

He is not and we must see such evils as intolerable.

The almighty God can protect us from serious harm by putting a force-field around us. That would be a simple solution.

The Free Will Defence says God gave us the gift of free will and we abused it so evil is our fault not his. The argument tells us that we should not be conscious beings who are living in a hedonistic paradise served by a loving God who protects us from all danger by a force field or whatever. That would allow us to have free will but to do no serious harm to others.

And the Defence is even against the idea that we should be happy beings whose wills are not our own but feel like our own but which are operated by God unknown to us. Love is a voluntary thing. And according to them, it is better to be able to love which means having free will, and according to them again, to be able to harm than to be a tremendously happy person who is not free and not capable of love. There is no evidence that we are really free anyway. Even if we are free we do not know for sure how free we are. So it could be that our wills feel like they are our own but are actually the result of programming that happens deep in our minds that we are not aware of. It would not mean necessarily that sensing you are free is an illusion. It would mean that feeling free is how the programming works. A computer can look like it is acting freely when it is in fact not. The look of being free is what it is all about for us and for computers.

God could put us in a universe we all feel free and loving but in fact are programmed. We wouldn't know any different and we don't know as it is anyway.

In that world where we think we are free and all is nice and pleasant we would feel free like we do now but we would be immensely happy and God would have programmed us to be good. We could feel free in that world just like we feel free under the influence of drink in this one though we are not. That would not require deception for they say that unbelievers have free will and who do not feel they are free still have free will so it would be possible then for people in that world to feel free and not be free and know or believe they are not free. And anyway God has rigged creation as it is to be often deceptive so he can deceive and we could say he has no choice but to deceive in the hypothetical world of pleasure and happiness and this is not lying for he has no choice but to hide the truth. If God loves babies he can love the inhabitants of the imaginary world because neither can use free will. And he could give us free will but prevent us abusing it and we would not abuse it anyway and lose the happiness he gives. He could prevent abuse by force if necessary.

Free will is about the power to sacrifice yourself in love for God and to help others.

You do not choose what is in you that makes doing sacrificial good a severe pain in the neck and if God cares so much about free will he would say in person that he wants it to be a pain for you and will then ask you to accept the pain and will stop it if you tell him to stop. Each person should be on an illusionary planet on their own with God though they think other people are there too so that the time will be all spent doing this and accepting the sacrifice if as we have seen others get in the way. If each should find goodness difficult then it would be each one helping herself or himself but only to please God and that should be hard. If God wants us to help one another then he is degrading us. People may still suffer but there will be less accidents and people getting caught up in other people's messes.

Sin is that which should not happen or which is useless. If God gave us free will to sacrifice then God gave us free will to sin for there is no sacrifice where there is no sin to cause suffering. Yet the defence says he does not intend that we sin with our free will. So sin is not useless after all. Thus belief in the free will defence encourages sin as long as it is repented later and a sacrifice is made over it - that's having the best of both worlds isn't it? And the worse the sin the better to enable others to sacrifice more and to sacrifice more ourselves to atone for it. When we have free will all the time we must be meant to sacrifice all the time or to make up for sin by immense sacrifices now and again and when there is nothing else to do which requires serious sin to make them possible. The defence is a complete failure. Yet it is supposed to prove that sin and suffering are not God's fault but ours.

Should people who do wrong, always feel unhappy by the power of God until they repent? Religion says no for it will mean that they avoid evil not because it is evil but because it will ruin their happiness. Unhappiness or the prospect of it makes it more likely for a person to do wrong. When retribution makes a person sin more, retribution should be scrapped. Cancelling retribution is only rewarding a sin when it is cancelled for nothing. Christianity rejects this sensible fact. It says

that though we would have been trapped in sin forever had Christ not saved us by his death, God was right not to pardon without it though it meant an increase of sin so that inhuman creed rejects this sensible fact. However, God would only have the right to keep us in sin if he couldn't stop us sinning which he could do even without force if he is omnipotent. If wrong makes you happy and right does the same you might as well do right and probably will. But the free will defence says that good has to be a free willed sacrifice.

God is supposed to give us a lot of freedom to do terrible things. Yet he is not worried about our freedom when he forbids us to believe there should be a force field around our children which protects them from suffering. The Church will say they will never learn to be compassionate if we get this force-field. But what if they are destined to be taken from this world at seven or so? He can't allow us to believe there should be protection from pain because he does not give such protection and he does not stand for being criticised.

The Church defines compassion as the attitude that a person should not be suffering and of being willing to do whatever you can about it therefore to limit your compassion by wishing there was no force-field just to please a God is seriously wrong.

A God who stands for "goodness" like that is not a God or worth worshipping - the whole point of serving God should be to better humanity in a measurable way. (I mean the excuse that God commands obstinate obedience to laws regardless of the consequences because he has something good up his sleeve that we cannot understand is not on!) And God does stand for it so he should be relegated to the same bin as Santa Claus. God wants you to force yourself to believe your ailing child should suffer - yes force for it is so unnatural and contrary to what you want - so that is the kind of compassion he has for you and the kind of respect he has for your will!! To say he allows suffering for he wants you to be free is not acceptable because he cannot give a toss about freedom. When he doesn't care much for you how could he really care about your freedom? Some would say that to say that is a very cruel and hateful thing for it is condoning the barbaric ways of a tyrant. God does not care about what you think. All he cares about is what he thinks.

Nature makes us think that God should put a force field around our children to save them from suffering. God does not have any regard for our free will at all for we are not allowed to suggest it. Faith is in an almighty God who could implement the force field system but doesn't. Faith is a violent attack by yourself on your own psyche. It's violence. It's self-abuse. It is therefore a proof that the free will defence is untrue because the defence requires self-degradation to work therefore it fails to defend anything except divine callousness which is indefensible. Violence on yourself is no basis for faith. It will only lead to the enabling of violence if not religious based bloodshed.

If we could create the force-field we would not be allowed to by believers. Think on that! If we could hypothetically fight almighty God and do it they would protest. Think on that!!!