

Talking about your faith in a higher power that looks after you is a bad idea because:

§ Higher power is usually a mask for the traditional Christian God. God is not in time but in eternity and so he does not change. He is not really like a perfect person who you can have a relationship with. Even if this God exists, the God you adore is one you construct in your head to make you feel you are dealing with your problems. That is not dealing with them. If it is just the power that helps you care about and not the relationship you don't care what you are opening yourself up to as long as you get help now. Do you not care even if it is the devil that is helping you for some evil plan? Do you hope that the fruits of his plan will affect others more than you?

§ The higher power is to be loved more than yourself and any human person for it deserves it more than anybody. Is that because it is good? No it cannot be. It needs nothing for it has tremendous power. It can forgo the right to be adored and loved. It doesn't need them. So it should forgo. Besides rights are based on needs. If the being doesn't need to be adored and loved it cannot claim a right to be. The Church says God asks us to love him because we want to be with him for he is the perfect source of happiness for he is perfect goodness. But that is really loving happiness more than God. God must forbid us to serve him if we do it for happiness. He wants us to serve him for him. This sounds hard and cruel but if he demands love he has no choice. Besides, happiness is just a feeling anyway so he can implant it like drugs can but without any bad effects. We don't need to be with God to be happy as the happiness of many who don't believe in God can testify. So God is loved for no reason except that religion wants us to serve him and he is presented as a being that goes out of his way to make us need him. This is the tyrannical might is right philosophy and explains why believers have been so strongly inclined towards violence throughout history. We do not desire perfect happiness – imperfect happiness will suffice and we all get by on it if we accept it.

§ We should do good because we see it as good and not because a God threatens us to do it or because he says it must be done. We must not do it because he sees it as good but because we do. Thus there is no need for belief in God and religion has caused fuss and trouble and war by causing needless division in the world.

§ If we are to love the higher power or God or Jesus more than ourselves then is it because the power is good, powerful or conscious? Consciousness is the most important element of being a person. It is the absolute essential. So God should be revered more because he is conscious than anything else and certainly not because he has power for power doesn't automatically give the right to be respected. When his awareness is his essential it follows that it determines how we should treat him, not his goodness. We must respect his awareness because it is him and his goodness is just something his consciousness can exist without. This indicates that we must put God on the same level as ourselves and give him no more respect than is due to anybody else. In other words, we cannot consider him to be a real God for God means the Supreme Being that is perfect and deserving of all the love that has ever been lavished and more.

§ To say the higher power lets people suffer for a purpose is to say that evil is not thoroughly intolerable. It partly or fully condones it. That kind of attitude is totally offensive because it is best and safest to believe humans should not be imperfectly good or suffer - full stop. It is desensitising and when Christians say they don't find it that way, we can be sure that it is in spite of their faith for that is not what would be expected. We have to put up with evil only when we can't get rid of it but that does not mean we should agree with that state of affairs. If we are going to pass over the assumption that evil should hurt people then why not pass over people who advocate the belief that disabled people deserve what they suffer because of sins committed in a past life? Why not pass over those who say it should be gloated about? It is unforgivable for a Christian to condone God sending a killer virus to a baby when he or she is alive and well for he or she is not on the receiving end. Additionally, life is more important than happiness when we should all be happy. The same is true of every moment of life – it is absolutely valuable. Therefore God has no right to hurt us or let a disease attack us for any reason. He should use force fields so that we cannot hurt each other and let us harbour black hearts if we want without trying to discipline us by suffering for we will enjoy them and happiness comes first. He could do something if not this. There certainly should be no dying allowed by God for life is so valuable. Religion is totally evil for all evil is a refusal to value human persons and there is no excuse to be made for it and if there is then we must say those who incite to murder mean well. A God who permits suffering could also permit the unnecessary killing of his children for both equally deny the absolute value of life. To honour God is to honour death.

§ The higher power is very obviously more generous in his grace, the help to live a good life, and his blessings to some rather than others. Believers say he owes us nothing for we are sinners so he can give and retain grace as he likes. But that is saying God has the right to leave some people more open to the influence of evil and sin than others. He does not. A God like that has no business condemning evil and he denies he has the right to be served. We demean ourselves and others by believing in God. If we think we experience grace and unique blessings then we will become smug and arrogant when we behold those who are less well off. Christian children have been led to think that Christian adults have lived with God in their hearts longer than them and are a better position to decide how children should behave. The idea of a God whose

mysterious rules should be obeyed endangers these children. It makes them less sceptical of adults than they should be. An unbelieving child could never be told that his mother is right to beat him up for the Bible commands that children be physically disciplined. An unbelieving child has enough on his plate with obedience to parents without directives and inspirations from God being used as an additional source of authority.

§ Scientists and philosophers disagree on whether or not God can be proven. Those few that do believe do not agree on what kind of God exists. So to adore God then is to adore a construct of human opinion. So there is no point then in adoring him. Religion says that God though personal is the same thing as goodness and love. It follows then that those who believe in abortion and adore God and those who forbid abortion and adore God have different moralities and therefore different Gods. This is a serious difference for it could mean the difference between somebody's life and death. People invent their moralities - or most of the moral rules in any case - and worship them as God. Some see nothing wrong with capital punishment and others do. They take sides in disputes. They exalt their opinions as if they were gods. It is themselves they adore more than God. You need absolute proof that your morality is right otherwise the morality is just a form of idolatry and is about control of others and using the God concept to get it.

§ Forgiveness, the big attraction about believing in a higher power who forgives sin, is an act of hypocrisy. It is said we have to forgive and be merciful for none of us is innocent. So if we are innocent we must be entitled to refuse to forgive. That shows that the forgiveness is not forgiveness and it is grudging. It is done not because it is right but because we can't always take justice. It is like forcing somebody to give you a sweet and calling them generous. Oh the damn hypocrisy! Are we to forgive for the past can't be changed and only the future matters? Again the forgiveness is grudging and fake because you would not be forgiving if you could interfere with the past. The higher power demands that we forgive and he forgives. His forgiving implies he is a fake and a liar and a hypocrite. If he is unable to punish that does not mean he has to forgive. He could still hold to the underlying attitude that you should be punished. He could be like a man who knows you have killed his wife and who has not forgiven you though he does not punish you or seek your punishment. Forgiveness is not an act of kindness for we are said to be punished because we are persons so punishment is an act of love and respect for us and giving us what we asked for by doing wrong. If you forgive the sinner but hate the sin what kind of forgiveness is that? Forgiveness admits the sinner is the sin in the sense that personalities become evil to make sin possible so to hate the sin is to hate the sinner. It is absurd and deceitful as, "Forgive the sinner but don't forgive the sin".

§ At Church you are told about a God of miracles or supernatural acts that change natural law. This is harmful because it undermines the strength of our belief in nature. We need to treat nature as uniform and unchanging and to believe that it is. We have to for the sake of humankind and nothing has the right to diminish the absolute importance of the human person. For example, belief in miracle makes you slightly less sure that a man blowing himself up will die for a miracle might save him. Even if you believe God will not save him this is only a belief that could be right or wrong and you are still less sure that he will die. The more miracles you believe in the more evil you become. Jesus Christ, the prime supposed miracle monger, was evil. Even if we are wrong, we are better to have a strong belief in nature.

§ The higher power will do things that we cannot understand and which test our faith. God demands obedience and obedience presupposes obeying a person just because they say so even if they sometimes explain their actions. If the boss at work tells you to do something, you don't ask why all the time. You just go and do it. If you understand why somebody tells you to do something, and then you do it, you are doing it because it makes sense and not because they ordered you to do it. This is not real obedience. Obedience is submissive and there is no real submission in that. You just do the thing because you agree with it. God or the higher power can have rules that we don't understand like birth-control and safe sex outside of marriage being necessarily wrong like you have in the Papal Church. This is dangerous for it opens the way for religion to do harm with evil rules while using the excuse that the rules are a mystery. They often say the rules are beyond reason but not against it and that this is true even if we have no reason to think the rules are right. They remind you that just because something looks stupid it might not be and they say God knows what he is doing even if we fear he does not. The truth is that if the mysteries are beyond reason you don't know if they really are not against it. You don't know if the revelation you were led to believe came from God is credible or not when it contains mystery. You can get people to do anything if they believe in mysteries of that kind. One error is enough to refute the divine origin of a revelation for God makes no mistakes. So credibility is going to be a problem. The more mysteries in a theology or religion then the less credibility there will be.

§ When most people say they believe in a higher power or God, what they mean is that they assume there is such a being. They don't really believe. Even if they can give some evidence of such a being it does not follow that they believe. Belief is based on evidence. There is some evidence for most things. What you have to do is focus on what the best and or most evidence says and let it tell you what is likely to be true. In other words, let it cause your belief. But you can't be said to believe all the things that there is evidence for. Truly indeed most of our beliefs are really assumptions and not beliefs at all. You have to provide good strong evidence for the existence of the power before you can ask anybody to believe that you believe. Most religious "belief" is really a collection of assumptions that the victims are conditioned to make. Catholic priests with great determination want children indoctrinated because they know children are easily conditioned and indeed if the priests were that confident about the veracity and correctness of the Catholic religion they wouldn't need to do that. The result is something that is not faith or belief but mimics it and makes a good counterfeit. The baptism of children and

the confirmation of teenagers and all things that are done by religion to people under eighteen are manipulations and arise from the exploitive tendencies in religion.

§ Religious evidence for God is based on the thought that God is the answer to the question, "Why is there something rather than nothing?" (The question summarises what all the proofs for God are about.) That implies that they can understand that it must be God. But nobody can understand it and they admit that. They say creation is a miracle as if not understanding something means it has to be supernatural. So they can't claim that God is the answer. They still have the arrogance to do that. To spout nonsense like they do for the sake of defending a belief that urges them to hold that God lets evil happen for he has a wonderful purpose for it is just vile.

§ Belief in God is supposed to be such a great thing that you are classed as a sinner if you don't believe. You are supposed to be demeaning yourself and excluding enrichment from your life. Rights are based on justice. So if we do an injustice to ourselves by not believing or listening to the gospel we can't be said to have the right to do so and besides what about the right of our neighbour to see a good example in us? So belief in God implies that we have no right to be offended at religious attempts to condone the evil in the universe in reference to God. But we obviously do.

§ Christianity says God because he is all-good does not make evil for evil strictly speaking does not exist. Evil is what you call good that falls short of what it should be so evil is not a power or an entity or a created thing. But if evil has a purpose then surely God could make it if it was a power? Surely the purpose would justify making it? They say God tolerates evil for a purpose and then they contradict themselves by saying that if it were a power he couldn't have a purpose that justifies it. God does not exist for evil exists. They know that. The danger is that when people are conditioned to believe in God that this conditioning will induce them to condone God's evil even when they find out that evil disproves God. Also evil and good are mixed together. You could think war is better in God's eyes than peace for it makes the afflicted kinder to one another and soldiers prove their bravery and vanquishes the "wicked". To justify that thinking you would need to get a revelation from God for lots of people disagree with you. We see then that the doctrine of evil being a falling short commands that we accept the dangerous and divisive doctrine of revelation from God. You would need to be able to prove the revelation true and from God. No religion can do that so religion is irresponsible for dishing out what it claims without justification to be the word of God.