

THE RUDENESS OF GOD AS A CONCEPT AND AS A SUGGESTION

The God belief is extremely rude. It is bad enough for a person to suggest it but for a religion to suggest it is far worse. That is because the religion has a bigger voice than an individual. Religion bestows collective responsibility on its members. That is what religion is for.

God is defined as all-good and perfect and creator of all things. God then is more valuable than any person or thing. When one does wrong, it is not so much hurting another person that is bad but hurting God. Thus to adopt this belief is automatically give yourself and everybody else a lower importance. People should be your God the one thing you would sacrifice all for. To admit to belief in God is to say to others, "My belief is more important than you."

All the proofs for God boil down to answering God to the question, "Why is there something rather than nothing?" But this question is unanswerable. We can't understand if there is a God why there is a God instead of nothing. So the proofs can't work for we don't know what the answer is and it is bigoted and arrogant to answer the question with God. The question itself makes no sense for if there was nothing it would be, "Why is there nothing rather than something?" That implies there should be something rather than nothing. But it makes no sense for nothing can't produce anything. Nothing is just nothing. To answer God is pretending to give an answer. Its dishonest. Its dogmatic and dogmatic is bigoted. The believer has no right to object to bigotry. Believers don't understand God. Yet they have the arrogance to try and answer a question nobody understands: "Why is there something rather than nothing?" with something they understand just as much or less!

Christians can't solve the problem of God allowing so much evil and making animals prey on each other and inflict cruel deaths. Before they can use God as an answer to "Why is there something rather than nothing?" that is one thing they have to do. They can't and don't. It is like asking, "Why is Miriam dead not alive?" and answering that John killed her without having reasons for thinking John did it. It is wrong to assume that evil and suffering have a purpose with God - that is making less of the evil and suffering. It belittles the people who suffer just like it would be belittling a child to say that his abuser may have had a good reason to abuse.

"Why is there something rather than nothing?" is a clever red herring. The question is meant to stop us asking, "How is there something rather than nothing?" Religion says that God and creation are mysteries that we cannot understand. They are miracles. To turn nothing into something is a miracle and a miracle by definition cannot be explained and how it happened can't be understood. If you can't answer or understand the how then you can understand the why even less. The how is more important than the why. That is because if you don't know how God created all things and understand all that then there is no point in asking why. Perhaps God can't make things out of nothing in which case there is no point in asking why he made all things out of nothing. If you do ignore how to ask why, it is like asking why John killed Miriam before you wonder how he did it. The how comes before the why. If there is no how there is no why.

Because how and why are indispensable to each other the question should be "How and why is there something rather than nothing?" It should not be "Why is there something rather than nothing?"

The argument that the universe is designed so God designed it is insulting for it seeks to answer the question, "Why is there order in the universe when there could have been none at all?" with God. It is evil to ignore the evil and disorder in the universe to focus on the seeming order to show there is a God. The evil and waste and disorder overwhelms the order. There will come a time when the whole universe will be wreckage. It shows Satan is God and we should serve him if it shows any God exists! The believers are being flippant for what would you say about society rewarding a man who does more evil than good for the good he does?

God hides. Religion despite teaching that we will love best when we are with him in Heaven and see him and know he exists teaches that he hides so that we may love. Apparently if we know God exists that will stop us loving others for we won't be free to love. We need freedom to really love. The God concept implies that there is more freedom in ignorance than in knowledge which is not only untrue but vile and obscurantist. Besides God is supposed to be free and loving despite knowing he exists!

To say God exists is to say that if he exists there is a problem of evil. The believers say that if he does not exist then we have the problem of good. The believers put a symmetry on the questions. They think the scales balance.

To be God, God has to be the origin and essence of all good. So the idea of a problem of good if there is no God goes with the idea of the existence of an all-good and sovereign God.

Back to the two questions. If the scales balance then the problem of good is compatible with the thought that the problem of evil does not refute God. Or we can assume that they are incompatible. If we assume that then we assume that there is no God. Or we assume that we cannot solve the puzzle and so we should suspend judgement on whether or not God exists. So the questions give us no reason to believe in God at all. We might as well just guess. Also the questions give us three options and two of them counsel us not to believe in God so the odds in favour of God are poor.

We need the problem of good to be more important than the problem of evil. It is more important to get an answer for it. This is necessary to avoid us believing in an all-good God while not taking evil that seriously. If the problem of evil is a bigger problem than the problem of good then we are believing in God despite the evidence and have some coldness in our hearts.

If we assume the problem of good is solved by saying there is a God we must admit that there is a problem of evil but hold that this problem does not refute God. Evil by definition is what should not be. So the idea of a God who makes things fall short of the goodness they could have or who makes evil for a good reason is incoherent and insensitive and blind to the horror of the suffering of others. The Christian will never suffer as much as other creatures in the world do and therefore has no right to say this evil should be allowed to happen by God. Experience it all first - which is impossible - and then decide. There is something vulgar about a person who has a healthy life saying God sent Angie some cancer for a noble reason! Nobody can tell anybody they know how they feel or that they should feel it is agreeable with the existence of a loving God.. Yet religion teaches people to pretend that they know that all the evil in the world can be ultimately justified and or condoned.

Spinoza wrote that we only judge things to be good because we want those things (page 204, The Book of Atheist Spirituality). So because we want comfort for ourselves in the face of suffering and because we want to believe that God supports us we warm ourselves to the suffering of nearly all creation.

The scales do not balance.

When we try to balance them, we end up claiming we have the right to assume that evil and good are agreeable. That is as bad as assuming that somebody being tortured is getting a favour. So the scales, because of that implication, are in favour of the thought that evil is better than good. Another way, it is making the problem of good equal to the problem of evil or vice versa. This denies that God will ever triumph over evil. It certainly takes away the attraction of believing in God.

If the problem of good is equal to the problem of evil then how do we know if we should be saying, "Evil does not disprove the existence of a good God" or "Good does not disprove the existence of an evil God" or both?

The scales are tipped by the problem of evil. Without God, good would still exist for if there is nothing, it is good that there are no people around to suffer. So you don't need God to explain good. There is no problem of good. But if you believe in God you end up with a problem, the problem of evil. You are in effect believing in God not because of goodness but because of evil. So the scales tip in favour of there being a problem of evil because there is no problem of good. They make evil a bigger problem than good. So good is unlikely to be compatible with evil. This implies that God's existence is unlikely. The belief you have in God is asking you to say God is right to let so much evil and suffering happen though it is unlikely that this is right. That is not a very compassionate attitude.

Belief in God is evil for we need the scales to tip in favour of the doctrine that if God does not exist then there is a problem of good which can only be solved by believing in God. They do not. The problem of good fails to convince us God must exist. If the scales tip the other way, which they do, then believers are believing in God because of the problem of evil which is not only irrational but is refusing to acknowledge that evil is vile. You don't consider a man with whom there is a serious problem of evil to be a good man because of the evil. If you do, then what you are doing is condoning the evil and blessing it.

Believers insult good by describing it as a problem if there is no God. They don't know what good is when they can say that. They don't know that good will be whether there is a God or not, whether there is anything or not. The evil person has a warped sense of good that blinds him or her to what good is. That is what makes her or him bad. The God belief is making believers evil.

The argument that design and goodness in the universe and in people shows there must be a God to make the good is to be rejected for it insults good in the way we have shown. Christians sometimes say that God made all things and designed all things without intending it to be an argument for God. But argument or not, they are saying wicked things.

The failure of the problem of good logic to show that there must be a good God shows that there can't be a God!

Humankind is supposed to have been made by God in his image. Most people are so mediocre and many are evil so that

doesn't say much for the original! The Book of Atheist Spirituality then concludes that belief in God is a sin of pride for saying that there is a grand and fantastic cause of all that is mediocre and evil and weak in human nature (page 122). The Book states that atheism is the converse, it is humility. God is a blasphemous and disappointing belief if you try to get to know him by looking at yourself or others who are supposedly his mirrors! It can only lead to humiliation!

Freud declared that illusions are not necessarily false. You can have an illusion that conveys truth to you. You can have the illusion that you have cancer and when you get checked out it is found you really do have cancer. But he declared that illusions are beliefs caused by our desires. He thought God was an illusion. Religion tricks and manipulates people to think they want belief in God. What people really want is to believe that all bad things can be turned okay and that we can even survive death. We complain about life and we suffer and despair but we accept these as long as we can handle them. God has strange plans and so there is no guarantee he can or will help us. Belief in God is rank illusion - it is a belief caused by desires we imagine we have. It is a delusion.

Religion says that God being all good and the maker of all things does not make evil for evil is a falling short of what something ought to be, in other words, evil is abused good. If that is true we should be looking at the good side all the time. If we do that then there is no use in bothering trying to formulate moral rules. Poor Jack the Ripper was a good killer and wanted rid of prostitutes for they were spreading diseases. To say that evil isn't so bad for it is merely warped good or misplaced good is to mock the afflicted.

Religion says God is entitled to make some people tend to be good to others and to make people who prefer to do harm. They call that monstrosity God of theirs good! Satan at least only suggests sin but here we have a God who sets the stage for its production! People can't change a genetic god given disposition to evil and yet God blames them for giving into it.

Religion that adores God says evil is not real but merely misplaced good for God cannot make evil power and remain good. For their God theory, we are expected to pretend that unhappiness isn't a real power but an imbalance of good or good things in the wrong place. But it is a real power. If unhappiness were unreal medication wouldn't work to fix it.

Many religionists say that God sends suffering so that we may help sufferers or that sufferers may learn to be more patient. That is really saying we are playthings in the hands of God. A father wouldn't inject his baby with a disease so that people may help the baby or so that the baby might have sympathy for sickness. Doing that is evil. It is putting virtue before people. An attitude like that leads to bad example and makes religious people revel in cruelty.

If you believe in a God who guides people, you will believe that it is possible that you can have a unique insight into truth. Belief in God encourages totalitarianism - it encourages opposition to the view: "Everybody should be listened to with respect for all have different perceptions and versions of the truth".

Belief in God implies that fundamentalism, the attitude that my religion should prevail for its not probably right or possibly right but it is simply right. How? If God exists he is of extreme and ultimate and infinite importance. To say God exists is to say that you should submit to his authority and truth. It is saying the belief has to be taken not seriously but extremely seriously. It says religious belief is important. It must not be watered down for unbelievers or heretics.

Jesus was setting an example of fundamentalism when he said, "I am the Truth" in the Gospel of John". The Bible claims to be devoid of error. There is no point in a man or book claiming to be without error unless they can and intend to bring people to the truth.

Religion says that miracles such as men coming back from the dead by the power of God really happen. It says they are signs from God that he is speaking to us. Religion says that miracles are not God violating nature for God sets nature up and if he had to violate it, it would mean he lost control over what he made and had to force it to do what he wanted. They say miracles that violate nature are fictitious even if the whole world says they happen. So this is their view about the miracles they report, "The miracles do not violate nature but agree with nature." But they are only supposing that. They can't give any evidence against the view that these miracles are violations or may be and so should not be taken seriously. If God calls us to take miracles as signs then he is no better that a man who asks you to believe Maria killed the murder victim though it could equally have been John. Miracles are supposed to be more serious than that for murder is more likely than miracle and miracle is a communication from God the source of all right and wrong according to the God-believers. So they certainly justify the man's attitude.

If God is that special as a suggestion never mind a belief then that is an implied attack on anybody who disagrees that it is a good suggestion or a true one. To say atheists spend too much time trying to refute God is accusing them of being secret believers who hate God or hate the truth. One answer is that refuting God is more than just refuting a belief. It is about the bad things connected to the belief. Another is that spending a lot of time showing what the Nazis were like does not mean you hate them or are a secret Nazi or even that you hate them. Why wouldn't you devote a lot of time to these projects? People do that and that is fine. If evil cannot fit with God then anybody saying it does is saying something immoral. If

there is no God it is true that it is evil for a baby to suffer and the evil definitely refutes him. If so then it is evil to say it does not. It would be like saying a child killer could somehow be good. The atheist has the right to attack belief in God if his motive is to be God to others and wash away their tears and bind up their wounds. Somebody has to especially when there is no God to do it.

Believers claim, "It is more important to believe in God if there is a God than to not believe if there is no God." That actually hints that you are better to believe in God even if there is none than not to believe. That casts doubt on their neutrality and fairness. God is thus an idol - some kind of wish fulfilment.

It is hard to see how if God comes first you could consider anybody to be nice person who doesn't pray or go to Church. Even if believers in God like such people, they are being inconsistent. Let's pretend belief in God doesn't necessarily have such implications. The fact that the belief could lead to such behaviour is enough to condemn it.