

Why God cannot be a God of Compassion or want us to be truly compassionate

People confuse sympathy and compassion. Sympathy is a feeling of pain at the pain of another. By itself it is not compassion. It only becomes compassion in so far as you do something to help be it listening or something else. Compassion also includes feeling how vulnerable others are in life even if they are okay now.

Compassion may be a feeling of concern for the other but though compassion is not empathy it needs empathy. Thus you need to try and share in the suffering of the other to put yourself in their shoes so that at the very least they do not feel alone and misunderstood. Compassion is feeling for the other but to a lesser extent it is feeling with. You cannot feel for the other unless you try a little bit to imagine and link with what they are feeling.

Compassion is better than love. The two are not the same. If there is a choice between love and compassion choose the latter. A religion of love is as a result intrinsically flawed and thus must take the blame for the evil that people do even if it disapproves of it.

Love and compassion are always treated as simple answers and simple but they are not. That is why they cause so much trouble. The idea of God makes it far worse. God becomes a rationale for making it simple. God is thought to be there to make sure your love and compassion work for the good as he is love and compassion and all powerful so they have to win! Those who give these simple answers do so for they do not really care and want to feel as if they are good people.

COMPASSION AND JUDGING

Compassion has a judgmental side. If Ann is made sick by her husband or neglected by him when seriously ill then compassion says it is a disgrace. A God who commands compassion is in some way telling us to judge and risk hating the husband. He claims to be compassionate himself so that says a lot about him.

GOD CANNOT SUFFER AND SO HE CANNOT SUFFER WITH US

God sends suffering but he cannot suffer as he is the all-perfect being. God cannot suffer for to suffer implies that one is imperfect and does not have all one needs or wants and God is perfect and has all he needs so he cannot feel the pain of compassion. If God could suffer then since God is perfectly good without suffering or even if he never suffers – he would not be perfect if he suffers – it follows that God should not suffer. Compassion is suffering with those who suffer. God cannot have compassion. The Church says that God's compassion is a metaphor for he behaves as if he has compassion! A God like that is no role-model or inspiration for us.

When God cannot feel compassion how could compassion be an ideal for us to aspire to? To make compassion a virtue is to imply that you are better than God.

It is better for God not to make people at all if they will bring him pain. He owes his love to himself as being the perfect being so he can only love them for his own sake which is not loving them at all. It is ludicrous to suggest that he will become man to die for their sins and atone for them because that implies he does it for them. He does not for he can be perfectly happy and let them all go to Hell forever. He only does it because he can do it and it is not for them for he doesn't need to save them and he only really loves himself. When God owes himself all his love it follows that if he suffers because of our sins or if they upset him, then he is doing wrong by making us for justice says the perfect being should come first and be the only important thing for he is the origin of all things and does not need to make what will bother him.

Even if hypothetically we say that God should suffer we mean that in a sense he should. We say that we would agree if possible that there could be a suffering God. But if God is all perfect then this hypothetical reasoning seems to be forbidden. If God is perfect then this perfection deserves 100% adoration but the hypothetical thing throws a but into it...

GOD COMES FIRST

Christians believe God only lets us suffer if it is worth it to try and make us holier or more virtuous. This is what you could call the Discipline Defence. What else could you expect them to say?

If we suffer to be made holier than God must come first. He must want all our love. If he did not then he could tolerate our wickedness but not let us go too far which might justify some evil but not evil to the extent that we have it in this world. So we are to love God alone and love others for his sake (not literally loving them then). Good is simply putting God first and nothing second. This means that we are here to simply choose between loving God and not loving him. So people do not suffer so that we may help them and be compassionate and patient or that we might not help God – for God is able to help himself – but please God. Then you are not thinking of the suffering so there cannot be compassion for the victim and why feel sorry for God when his happiness cannot be marred? You cannot. It is hard and cruel to turn your compassion off for a suffering person and transfer it to God. Only a monster could do that and that is what God religion as taught by the Bible and by Jesus wants you to do. It wants you to be a psychopath. Faith turns you into a psychopath and when that happens you will still be one if you lose your faith in God. Maybe you will be a less sick one then but you would be worse then if you continued to believe.

DISCIPLINE DEFENCE SHOWS LITTLE OR NO COMPASSION

The discipline defence teaches that evil and suffering are allowed to happen by God because they are useful for disciplining us. Through suffering we can grow in goodness and good character and through having people help us they can grow in compassion and practice their virtues. This will supposedly improve them.

If you have to suffer to be a better person then clearly the most important outcome should be compassion for others who suffer. Why? It is obvious that if suffering helps improve you as a person then compassion, because it is so beautiful and painful and valuable and helpful, should be number one. There is an obvious connection.

But do not forget that once you say that the love of God comes first you end up putting compassion for others down the scale. If you say that you must only have compassion for God says so then it is about God not the people you suffer for at all.

Compassion is suffering when you see other people suffer and suffering with them in the process of helping them if possible. Compassion is a great thing but as we are all flawed it has to be flawed too. It is not right to say that people must be allowed by God to suffer in order that we may give them our faulty compassion. In fact, the discipline defence is not about humility but faking humility and pumping up our compassion into a greater thing than it really is.

The claim that evil and suffering and temptation are allowed so that works of compassion might happen infers that you bring suffering on yourself by your lack of self-discipline so it forbids compassion. It leads to the despised concept of all suffering being punishment for sin or if it is not punishment it is still your own fault.

Love is strict with regards to yourself and to others, as Christians delight to remind us. God will be strict. But there are hardly any people like that so his disciplining is a waste of time for he wants us to be like him. People just don't want to make others' lives a misery through correcting themselves and others from sunrise to sunset. Since love is strict and God comes first and wants us to eradicate sin rigidity will be the supreme virtue. But if we do not believe in God we will feel at ease with tolerating these things and we don't have to be strict. If forgiveness is wrong (and it is - it is not necessary though it is necessary to try to avoid having painful feelings because somebody has hurt you for too long) the discipline defence is meaningless for compassion and patience would be sinful. Forgiveness is wrong for there is no free will - free will is the teaching that when we made a choice we could have made another one - so there is nothing to forgive.

It is impossible for you to be compassionate to a person and love God when the compassion implies, "This should not happen at all. It is terrible and I feel terrible about it." That is really blaspheming God for sending the suffering. Religion says that the love of God and people go together. If that is true, then you are in bother whether you reject God for people or people for God. Anyway back to your compassion. It is criticising God so the attitude is, "I feel nothing for you and I only help you to please God who is right to torture you so that I can prove that I am virtuous." It is proved to you more than anybody so this is self-righteous and arrogant and flippant. The discipline defence destroys itself.

Religion may try to soften the disastrous discipline defence by saying that it is true that the discipline should not happen for we should not have abused our free will to make it necessary for God to do hurtful things for the sake of chastisement to us. Some softening I must say - it only makes it worse. Religion is saying somebody is to blame for the suffering. If it is not the sufferer it is somebody else or both. It hardly makes for great charity and trust in other people. Also, Christians are obligated to blame themselves rather than anybody else and to worry about their own faults more than those of others. The victim then must blame herself or himself. If I am to blame for my sickness, that is, if I should assume the sickness is sent for me to develop MY compassion, then clearly we must pressure the sick to carry out good works and donate as much as possible of their money to the poor.

God sends suffering for the sake of developing compassion to a person under the present circumstances. These circumstances are largely beyond our or the victim's control. All we can do to alleviate the suffering or get it stopped is let

ourselves learn from it and do good works to fight it. Thus the victim should blame us or herself or himself if there is no end in sight to the suffering. We have not been responding correctly and thus we are keeping the suffering happening. A doctrine like this means that when your compassion improves so will your resentment. The victory over the evil of being non-compassionate is a pyrrhic victory!

We know it is wrong to feel sorry for anybody who is suffering what they deserve. Some people who suffer reason, "I have to suffer anyway. I take this for my sins and will use it to heal myself of my sinful tendencies." They consent to it. It follows that those who consent to their suffering are for the same reason not entitled to compassion. This raises the question, "Should the sick person consent to their own suffering and will it to happen to them even if it is not their own fault?" The answer is yes if there is a God and if they should give others a reason to have no sympathy for them so that others will not suffer because of them – that is, have no compassion. Those who refuse to accept their pain deserve to suffer so they cannot win. This tells us that suffering is useless and cannot be intended to evoke compassion. What's the use of any virtue that suffering is sent to evoke and nurture without compassion?

Religion says that helping people spiritually is the best form of compassion. If you give a person bread instead of telling them what they have to spiritually improve about themselves then that is not compassion because it is expressing no compassion for their spiritual need which is a more fundamental one. We are told that God sends suffering to correct people but if we preached all the time we wouldn't be forcing him to send as much suffering. This at a stroke proves that God does not like the vast majority of acts that express compassion. If he made us suffer for the sake of compassion then why did he fail so dismally?

How could it be compassionate to advocate belief in and commitment to a God who has a fault with nearly everything we do? He's just like a policeman who wants you to slip up.

Compassion needs an ingredient and that ingredient is called worry. If a ship sinks and the survivors have not been recovered the Church will say it finds this worrying. But since the Church says we should only want people to survive for the sake of God and God could have done plenty of discreet things to save the people if there were no survivors or save more of them it follows that it is offensive to God to worry or to pretend to worry. You are really worrying about God not being able to do what he wants. The inhumanity of Christianity and Islam must be concealed no more. It is impossible to see how you could think it is terrible for a baby to be born handicapped by an act of God when it was God not man that let that happen without insulting God.

God promises us a perfectly happy existence beyond the grave so the virtues that suffering is sent for us to gain will be no good there. This implies that the virtues do not matter and only the suffering does. Compassion would be a sin if suffering does not really matter or does not matter at all.

Compassion is based on the idea that happiness is good. You feel for people and want to help them for they are not happy. So if happiness is a sin then compassion is a sin.

How could you be compassionate when you know that if a person lives on in this body that they will be more likely to remain alive than if they die and then say that God is right to let that person die or increase the chance of death or suicide by sending suffering?

If suffering is for the sake of discipline then how can you say that you wouldn't wish your terrible malady on anybody else if there is a God? It would be insulting God.

When life is the most important value (for if it is not it makes no sense at all to say that people should be happy) it is wrong to condone God's actions.

When God could do plenty to prevent us being so bad without taking away our free will he has no excuse for all the pain and suffering that happen unless he wants them to happen in which case compassion would be evil.

There are plenty of reasons why belief in God is harmful and therefore it is ridiculous to say that God makes us suffer so that we will love him more and be more committed to him. The more commitment the further you drift from reason and real goodness.

FINALLY

God cannot have compassion for us as God for he is like a mind without a body and too unlike us for us to be able to relate to or be inspired by his compassion. It is just a word where he is concerned. Believers run after a God like that because they don't like to be truly compassionate. It dehumanises those who suffer and thus the believer gets an ego boost from helping those "inferior" creatures.

