

Patrick H Gormley

GOD IS A HOAX

Divine Spirit is nonsense

Christians and Muslims take God to be the supreme perfectly good spirit that made all things.

God is used as an explanation for the existence and order in the universe. He is used to account for how the universe is kept in existence and also for how it seems to have been designed. Design requires a designer.

Let's look closer. Matter is that which has parts. If God is matter then there is no need for him as an explanation for he would be need to be explained too. Who made him and put him together? So it is said God must be a being that has no parts but is just pure spirit. Spirit is that which is real but which has no parts. If this sounds mad don't worry for nobody claims to understand it. So this thinking presupposes that God has no parts but is almost a kind of nothing.

There is no evidence at all for the existence of spirit. We are told that we experience spirit in the form of our own awareness and our thoughts. Sensing we exist does not mean we are spirit any more than an eye that sees must be a spirit. We think the thoughts in our head are non-material or spirit but are they? We cannot test or examine them to show they are non-physical. All we know is that we perceive thoughts but that is all we do. It tells us nothing about what they actually are. We do not experience anything of spirit. The doctrine that God is the best explanation for the universe's existence because he is spirit then only gives us a possible explanation at best not an explanation. The question is - is it really possible at all? As we cannot know if spirit even makes sense - for we cannot even understand matter never mind spirit - we have to be agnostic about spirit. The argument from a spiritual creator only leads to agnosticism not belief in God. To pretend you know more than you can in order to believe in God when there is so much suffering simply beggars belief and is a hideous thing to do. You are belittling the suffering of the innocent.

The Church says that whatever exists has to make itself or be made by something else. It says that the universe did not make itself therefore it was made by God who makes himself. But if God could make himself so could the universe. Then they say that the universe does not need to exist for it would make sense if it never existed. But it would make sense if nothing not even God existed as well. They say things in the universe cease to exist so God who cannot cease to exist must be causing everything to exist. But the things merely change forms. They do not cease to exist.

They say that God made all things out of nothing - meaning he didn't make it from anything. If God can create something out of nothing then he has infinite power for it takes infinite power to bring something out of nothing for the distance between the two is infinite. But since infinite means all power for it means power without limit - if you don't have all power then there is a limit to your power - and God must be his own power when he has no parts it follows that everything is God for it is made of God. God cannot create which is making something out of nothing for there can't be any more power than there is and this power is him. Creation is a ridiculous belief and all who believe in this God are closeted pantheists who declare that the lion is the man it eats. But the two have separate minds and you can't say it is an illusion and that it is one mind for that is as absurd as saying 1 is equal to 2. It would also mean there is no God for how could a being that becomes us to suffer and do evil be a supreme being? The only choice you have then is between atheism and pantheism and atheism has to be chosen for even if it is hard to believe it is better than pantheism which is impossible to believe.

The proofs for God basically are that there must be a spirit being that makes itself or is self-existent who has made all things and the design argument. All who use these proofs are really pantheists. But even if you prove this being you have no proof that it is a person and should be worshipped.

I should take my experience that I am not the incarnation of some kind of pantheistic God as proof that there is no God.

Spirit Intelligence

Some argue that only a perfect God can make the perfect things that exist in the universe. Even the most perfect art-form on earth is imperfect. We just don't see the imperfections. The fact that it cannot last forever is an imperfection. There is nothing perfect in the universe to imply a perfect God or perfect anything.

You would need to prove God first before you could say he was the designer so the proof from design is dishonest.

You can believe in an intelligent spirit being that controls all things and still be an Atheist for this being is more like a clever machine than a God. Religion claims that the maker must be perfect for he made many perfect things and has infinite

power and intelligence. But he can be perfect without being morally perfect. When it does what we think is morally wrong the act is perfect in the same way a perfect art form can look incomplete and still be perfect for it was perfect as it was intended. If we are the same being as that being, as in the theory of pantheism, then we will live forever. Religion says that if the being makes us conscious persons then it must be a conscious person because being perfect it cannot make anything better than itself. But it is perfect the way it is. The way it is, is perfect for it. The personal God they believe in makes stones and that certainly does not mean that God must be just a stone himself. These considerations prove that if such a being can be proved it is not a personal God or entitled to worship and that a personal and living God can never be proved.

The proof from suffering that there is no God

It is said that there are proofs for God's existence. Some philosophers say they are not proofs but possible indications.

Even if the proofs worked there is still the proof of suffering - an all-good God cannot stand by and let a baby suffer for nothing - and the experience that we are not God to stand against them. This would be a paradox if God exists. We would have to conclude that there is something we cannot grasp that explains or solves the paradox. We need not assume that our reason is defective or not intelligent enough at this point. We know that the proof of suffering and experience would be stronger than the other proofs for the other proofs are worked out like sums while suffering and experience prove themselves without working them out and are more direct – they are direct experience. If you see a gate no rational argument will be as powerful as your experience that you have perceived a gate. What is proven to my consciousness supersedes even what is proven by reason alone. Or what is direct supersedes what is indirect and harder to prove.

Evil and suffering exist. If they are illusions then they still exist for the illusions are evil no matter what the Christian Science cult says about evil being non-existent. Evil and suffering being unreal illusions would mean the illusions are evil. The religion of Christian Science only challenges the reality of evil for it realises that evil cannot be reconciled with the good God it wants to believe in. Interestingly, Christian Science in calling evil an illusion indicates that evil is wholly incompatible with the existence of a loving God and contradictory to it. The Churches agree but they add the bizarre doctrine that evil is compatible with the existence of this God simply because it is not an illusion! They say evil is real in the sense that it is not an illusion so God needs it for a purpose.

Here is the argument that evil disproves God.

God is by definition all good and all-powerful.

God is able to stop evil.

Conclusion: But evil exists so there is no God.

The believers say that what is wrong with this is that the definition of good is wrong – it defines good as happiness and pleasure alone. They say it is good to suffer to work for good so good is more than happiness and/or pleasure. They say you are more devoted to good if you undergo pain to make things better than you would be if you do not. But that makes the good that results less good not more good. A good party is one at which you feel well and make others happy not one that you have to endure because you have a sore back.

The religious doctrine of God directly implies that virtue is sometimes setting things up to boost unhappiness. The believers advocate an evil morality to justify belief in God. They make evil good in order to avoid the conclusion of the argument.

Religion says the error in the argument is in the conclusion for though God can stop evil he won't because he sees some use in it that makes it worth tolerating. This assertion implies that sacrifice is good for God has to tolerate evil for it is the only logically possible way to bring about that good.

God alone matters as he alone is deserving of perfect devotion and perfect happiness. God tolerating evil would only be allowed for his sake not ours. A God who tolerates evil for our sake would be degrading himself by inflicting tolerance on himself. Tolerance is putting up with evil you can do nothing about. But if you let this evil happen you cannot claim to be tolerant of it.

Believers in God advocate sacrifice. Why is sacrifice good? Because it intends another to be happy? Because it intends to be for your good later? Because it makes you both happy?

Why should you want another person to be happy and not you? If virtuous, the other person cannot be happy about what you have done for them in so far as it is your sacrifice for that would be selfish so sacrifice has to bring pain to the one it benefits. This is a travesty of right and wrong.

If sacrifice is for your own good then it is not sacrifice. The pain is necessary for future enjoyment and is a part of it. It is like saying that having a beer and enjoying it is sacrifice because you know this pleasure will be taken from you some day and you cannot enjoy it all the time.

If sacrifice is for you both then it is evil. It is not sacrifice in so far as it is for you and it mocks right and wrong by indicating that you should expect the other person to thrive at your expense.

If the sacrifice is just good because it is directed towards creating happiness then it follows that the sacrifice was regrettably necessary and it was a pity it had to be necessary. If so sacrifice should be avoided if possible. You can be a good person without ever sacrificing. This is what believers in the argument are saying. So it follows that God shouldn't require sacrifice of us and is evil for doing so. Yet believers in God say God needs evil for a good purpose which necessarily implies a need for sacrifice!

If the sacrifice is good for its own sake and the happiness has no bearing on the issue then pain is good, pleasure is bad and happiness is diabolical. That is what the believers must teach.

If happiness is the goal, we or you or the other person, should be happy instantly for a goal by definition is best reached immediately. We see then that if we teach that God should have created the world the way it is in which sacrifice is needed then we teach that the purpose of suffering is not to increase happiness but to decrease it. So God cannot be good if he requires sacrifice and has made a world that needs it when he might have made one that does not and gives happiness on a plate.

Religion says that good as a result of evil is better than good that did not come from evil. There cannot be a God then for his goodness was just given to him and did not come as a result of facing evil.

What if good as a result of evil is just as good as good that did not come from evil? Then it follows that there cannot be a God for it would make more sense for him to make sure that only good that does not come from evil exists.

If good as a result of evil is less good than good that comes from evil then it follows that there is no God for evil exists.

There is no God or higher being caring for us. If there were, our lives would be perfect for suffering and evil and temptation are useless when we don't have free will. The purpose of free will was that we could be able to sacrifice ourselves to obey God or to refuse to do so for only obedience freely given pleases God. God religion blames the abuse of this gift by us for the evils in the world to get God off the hook. Belief in God is harmful because it leads to the sinister doctrine of free will which claims to explain how a loving God could let us sin and abuse one another. Free will is no use unless we can be selfless so God commands self-sacrifice which is an evil doctrine. We can't be selfless for everything we do we want to do it under the circumstances no matter how unpleasant we find it so there would be no need for suffering and evil and instead of bad desires causing us to do harm we should have only desires and pleasures that make us harmless. We might as well be made enjoy ourselves all the time when we can make no real sacrifices – to sacrifice something for reasons of self-interest is not to make a sacrifice at all for you want to do it to be better off. A good God would not want your belief. Pain and suffering must be fought and destroyed rather than accepted as a way for God to discipline me for I should discipline myself if I need to and I shouldn't need to for it is none of God's business. God is a cruel concept for this reason and will lead only to cruelty. If it does not make people cruel it makes them implicitly cruel.

Let us examine the wickedness of every excuse for why God would allow evil.

We have dealt with the free will excuse.

Another excuse is that without evil there would be no evil for us to fight against. This obviously puts the struggle and struggle is painful before the results and implies that suffering is better than goodness. If you believe in God you simply have to accept this excuse for the way things are shows that if there is a God he wants us to struggle and do what we hate doing. This excuse here is the same as the one about love being sacrifice and it is a disaster.

Another excuse is that suffering is necessary to punish us for sin.

This is implied by belief in God because when the belief implies free will and that evil is the result of sin and that we need to have the chance to sacrifice to be good which we get thanks to evil which means that suffering is punishment for it says that happiness is a sin. Even if you hold that we punish ourselves by misusing free will and choosing evil you still end up vindictively stating that everybody deserves what they get.

Forgiveness is basic in relation to fighting evil for God says we all sin and we need to be forgiven by him before he will

accept our works and accept us. Forgiveness is refusing to punish a deliberate offence and says it has been repented so the punishment should be cancelled. Forgiveness is an evil thing because we all know that we only go for what we think and feel is best. The person we aim to forgive for doing evil is just wrong about what is best. He is not evil. He deserves help not punishment. Forgiveness says we should be punished for our evil though it refuses to administer that punishment. It agrees we should be punished even if for some reason punishment is cancelled or suspended. Sincere error is not punishable. A forgiving God is a vindictive God until you repent. And his devotees are to be as bad.

Imagine there could be a God over this world. Suppose he is not vindictive at all. Then he would make sure that people were most likely to disbelieve that sin exists. But religion cannot endorse that view for then there would be no God for the excuse for God allowing evil is that he wants us to sin if we choose to would be refuted. God implies approval for forgiveness and forgiveness is a manifestation of disguised hatred.

Another excuse is that suffering increases virtues like patience and compassion if not in the sufferer then in the carers. But only their choice can make it do that. And then it is not the suffering that does it but the choice. It is cruel to say you should hit somebody in order that their mother may pity them and this is just what this excuse for God is saying.

Another excuse is that there would be chaos if God intervened to protect us against suffering all the time. Not true. A force field around us would be all that was needed.

Another excuse is that we need evil so as to be able to know what happiness is. You can be happy without remembering that suffering exists so you can be happy without suffering.

Another excuse is that evil is required by God to give us material benefits. For example, he causes earthquakes in order to persuade us to move away from high-risk areas. But who made the faults in the earth's crust? Who made the viruses that so cruelly kill us? He could have given us the material benefits in the first place. This excuse denies that God is intelligent.

Another excuse is that evil is allowed for it drives us back to God for it shows us we cannot manage without him. So God sends things like earthquakes to teach us that we have to live by his commandments to survive. That is like killing somebody to show them they need you. Them needing you and not acting as if they do would be the lesser evil there.

Another excuse is that evil is non-existent and is just the absence of good. Believers say that God doesn't make evil for evil is not a thing like goodness is a thing but is simply a lack. They say that if God made evil as a power, God would be evil. They see evil as the misuse of good, good falling short of what it could be and not a power. So they say that God does not make evil for evil cannot be made in the same way tea can be made. They refuse to admit that evil is bad and that is what matters not if it is a power or a lack. They are just making excuses.

We can feel happy or unhappy or in-between which is the same as feeling both. Unhappiness is a feeling in its own right and just as real as happiness. To say that God isn't doing wrong by letting unhappiness happen for it is just the absence of happiness and not real is simply hard faced. Unhappiness is more than just the absence of happiness just like happiness is more than the absence of unhappiness. If unhappiness is the mere absence of happiness then why can't we say that happiness isn't real and is just the absence of unhappiness. In this way, the excuse denies that happiness is good so it is against reason. But that doesn't matter to religion which must condone divine evil at all costs.

The only way to avoid these facts is to say that evil is not unhappiness (or that unhappiness isn't bad or evil) in order to be able to say that good is the absence of evil. That has to be said in order to help belief in God keep its illusion of ringing true. If you say that it is not evil to be unhappy then it follows that morality is meaningless rules and making people feel good doesn't matter one bit. It's a recipe for a religion of pure evil.

Another excuse is that there is no limit to how much good there can be and since created things are not God they cannot be perfect no matter how good they are. Still no excuse for all the suffering we see here on earth.

Another excuse is that evil is necessary for warning us about the terribleness of sin. This presupposes that evil is the result of sin and that we have to see the results before we appreciate how serious sin is. But the whole point of sin is that you have to know that it is bad and how bad it is before you can commit it. You don't need to see the results. Evil or sin is disorder. You cannot sin or intend evil without intending to bring the power of disorder into your action and your world. If you don't understand that sin is disorder then you cannot sin for if you should do evil things you don't know what you are doing and so are not to be condemned.

Another excuse is that God can let us suffer now as long as he makes it up later on in Heaven or on earth. That is plain cruel.

Another excuse implied by the obvious silliness of the others is that evil is good when God does it regardless of how vindictive it is. It often takes the form of the argument: "God is God and not man and not subject to the same morals that man has." But we have feelings and superiority cannot give God the right to treat us horribly.

Saying that evil is a mystery, is a euphemism for this stance for we should be able to think of a moral reason or two why a good God might allow evil to subsist. To say we are clueless about why evil is allowed to happen and then to praise the God who allows evil to happen is just stubbornly condoning and making excuses for divine evil. People say if a person does evil and you have some indications that they are doing it for a good reason that is fine. But nobody says you should assume they are doing good in the absence of such indications.

There is no all-evil God which is obvious. And there is no mad God for there is too much order. And we know there is no evil God for the world would be Hell. We know there are not two rival and equal gods, one good and the other evil, for they would have given us free will. And it would be simpler for them to keep us half happy and half sad or half good and half bad all the time which makes it probable that they do not exist.

If there were many gods the good, bad or mad ones would be in the majority and we know what that would mean. Agnosticism is wrong because it says there could be a God. Evil would need to be our fault not God's if we want to maintain the notion of an all good god. Nobody has the right to say that God exists or that anything indicates that he does unless they can prove free will first for that is so basic. Free will cannot be proved for we don't see the inner causes of our choices. A drunk person feels free but is not. So in reality you are only guessing that you have free will and that evil is down to rebellion against God and not down to God. That is quite nasty.

Even if there is a God he has no relevance. We are naturally self-centred. Self-centred and selfish are not the same thing. Since we have no free will to be un-self-centred we can safely ignore him and ought to for he sends suffering for nothing and he wants to be ignored. When we are self-centred by nature we cannot help ignoring him and that is how he wants us to be.

Good should mean not wanting people to suffer. God should not want people to suffer then if he is good. So he hates using evil for a purpose so we force him to do it which means that when we need evil to be done to us we have nobody to blame but ourselves and it is impossible to see how the evil could make us holier people and more devoted to God when we are that low and sinful that we make God break his own heart.

Evil not only disproves God but makes it wrong and evil to say there is a God.

God was created by people who wanted you to serve their ideals so they made up a God who supposedly represents and commands these ideals so that you would not realise you were serving them and not God. They think their weak virtue is great that it is worth all the suffering that has ever happened in the universe. You cannot say God lets evil happen for he seeks to bring virtue out of it unless you experience your virtue as being worth it.