

## Vindication of the argument that evil logically disproves God

Logic is a tool that helps us find contradictions and avoid them. It helps us think and gives us much protection from error and lies. A logical contradiction is no better than a lie. You may as well lie. To argue that your dog is made of steel is illogical. You know it is not steel so to say it is, is to lie. Try not to think logic but feel it too. Don't let it be a cold enterprise.

Evil is that which is rejected by goodness and which rejects goodness. Evil is essentially a type of rejection. It is rejection first and rejection of good second.

If God is goodness then evil and God cannot agree.

Does that mean God can still let evil happen? Religion says that evil is not a priori incompatible with God or goodness.

That is the question.

So religion defines evil as that which is against God.

But they refuse to define it as that which contradicts the existence of God.

Thus when they say evil and God agree they are sneaking in an assumption which is that evil is never bad enough or important enough to be a disproof of God.

They argue that evil is the absence of good - in other words it is good in the wrong place and wrong time. But if evil is rejection then it is rejection that is in the wrong time and place. That makes it about when and where it happens not about what it is. That is really a denial that evil exists. It is about mistakes not moral evil. To argue that mistakes are moral evil is an act of unjust hate. Thus in order to believe in God one has to be riddled with passive aggressive hate.

*All the answers as to why God might allow suffering are immoral*

The answers to why God might allow suffering are offensive and degrading to sufferers and to dying children. When one needs evil to defend the goodness of God there is something wrong! The arguments supporting God may be spoken sweetly but they are disgusting and try to feel that their beauty and the lovely way they may be voiced to you makes them more vile. For example, the doctrine that God puts up with evil to overcome it with a greater good is lacking in compassion and it is coarse when coming from a pampered minister of religion. And free will is widely misinterpreted as saying you can defy God but that makes no sense if God is creator. You have free will to sin because of God and not in spite of him. That fact abolishes the appeal of God for it takes away the feeling that it is man who creates evil not him. Even if God can still be good we lose the value of the narrative: "It's us not God". The divine purpose and the free will excuse for evil are the core ones. The notion that evil is a mystery depends on the free will idea for if God controls our will and we sin then he sins too. Apart from that, the mystery notion is just a copout. It is worse than saying the petrol that vanished from your car is a mystery for nobody took it for somebody clearly did.

*It is Serious Enough to Demand a Logical Proof of Compatibility*

There is no logical argument proving that God and evil could co-exist. There is no logical answer to: "Whatever evil God lets happen the one thing that is off limits is little babies getting terrible diseases". Evil and suffering especially innocent suffering are so terrible and intolerable that you absolutely need proof that they could fit a God of love and be allowed by him to happen. When it is immoral to reject logical arguments for God from evil clearly the logical argument that evil refutes God is correct.

Plus if you merely say there is no logical contradiction that is not enough. Logic demands that you prove it. You cannot answer a maths question by writing down, "There is an answer and that is all there is to say".

*Hidden Assumptions about God and Evil?*

The logical argument that evil logically disproves God is accused of assuming the existence of good and evil which can only be assumed if there is a God. It says there is no God while assuming that there is. It therefore is supposedly incoherent. It is supposedly illogical.

The logical argument for God from evil is that for evil to exist good must exist so God must exist if evil exists.

Notice how believers in the logical argument against God are accused of assuming the logical argument for God is true!

If that accusation is correct, then both the logical argument from evil for God and the logical argument from good for God are guilty of not being arguments but of being based on assumptions themselves and thus are not so logical after all!

If there is a choice between two appalling arguments which one is the least dire?

It is logical to choose the one that best encourages us to do something about evil.

If evil is so terrible that it refutes God then we have to be God to others and do all we can. We do what a God should be doing.

The answer to the argument that good shows there is a God so evil shows it too for evil contrasts good and needs it as an opposite is that good is abstract and a default. It is real but not a thing. Even if there were nothing at all it would be good that nobody suffers. Good is a default and is wholly good regardless of whether there is a God or not.

Good is independent of God and judges God. That is why the logical argument against God is correct and valid.

A being has to follow good but which cannot be good as regards how good cannot be a person or thing is:

-Good in so far as it lines up to good.

-Is not good in the sense that it cannot literally be goodness itself. Goodness is real but it is not a person or thing.

So in a sense even an all-good God is bad.

That is why this God allowing such evil and suffering is inexcusable. Even good does not have the "right" to allow but only it would have the "right" if that were possible.

The logical argument for the non-existence of God as shown by evil is correct.

### *Analysis*

A logical argument against God and evil being both possible is a logical argument from morality. Evil is said by many to be logically impossible if there is a God. So since evil exists that means that there cannot be a God.

Are both sides being really logical or is one side just guessing as much as the other side is?

The argument that God can let evil happen is merely assuming it. As it is evil to in any way condone evil, if evil is so intolerable that a good God cannot let it happen then it is being condoned.

Better to risk seeing evil as being vile and be wrong than to risk diluting it a bit when it should be seen for the horror it is.

Thus the logical argument that God and evil can co-exist is false. The atheist argument that evil flatly disproves God is proven correct.

Religion argues, "God demands that we assume morality. Then we work out that a being can allow evil and be moral. Then we move to faith in God."

But there is something else.

Religion holds that a mystery need not be a cop-out. Sometimes evidence and solid logic point to something being a mystery. A mystery is a cop-out when there is no evidence that there really is a mystery there. But the mystery of evil is an evil cop-out for no matter how much evil God allows believers say it does not matter. And logic cannot show that evil and God can be compatible. And a logical argument that God and evil might be compatible is no good for you need more than possible for such a serious issue.

Religion says evil is a mystery and it fools you by seeming good and clever and then it goes all wrong and there is harm done that we never even imagined. If evil is a mystery, religion then has no right to say that it can be tolerated by a God. We don't really fully understand what evil is so we cannot say that evil fits the idea of a loving God. In fact claiming the right to say so is to lie and succumb to evil! If God's goodness needs us to turn evil to defend it then it is an abomination.

Some say that without the existence of God there is no evil and we should talk about things that just happen. "Evil" things are not evil. They just are. What happens just happens. There is no problem of evil then. If there is no such thing as correct mathematics then there are no maths problems.

This logic is just a variation of the argument that good cannot exist unless God creates it. If believers really agree with the argument then why do they not condemn atheists who administer justice against those perceived to be bad?

It is odd to argue that "evil things are just things that happen if there is no God - they are not evil" and then say it is evil to say that things are evil when they are not!! The believers have a logic hole. That alone shows the logical argument for God from evil is no match for the logical argument against God from evil.

### *The Possibility that Evil Contradicts the Goodness of God*

The argument that evil fits the existence of a loving God is in fact deflecting. It is looking at his existence not his loving nature. At first glance one thing existing does not mean another thing cannot exist. But see it as refuting a God who is love. It refutes his love and thus by default it refutes a loving God. So it is a less direct refutation of God than you think. But that only makes it stronger not weaker.

It does the same trick as arguing that the catastrophic bookkeeping of Mr X your bookkeeper who does not exist does not prove he does not exist. But if he is so incompetent he is not a bookkeeper at all. The argument directs you to his existence when it is about him being a bookkeeper.

Anyway the believers look at evil to see if there is any way they can mangle it to fit their glorious ability to recognise the love of God and thus show how superior and good they are in doing so. It takes being so good that you only see the good to a new level!!

They cannot deny that evil is that which is or could be a contradiction of the existence of God. God supposedly comes first which implies that evil is about defying him and he is about fighting evil. Any other problems with it are really aspects of one problem. But that stops us admitting evil might refute God! It is logical and ethical to say that and we must say it for those reasons! That shows there is something flawed in the notion that evil is merely anti-God.

Good and evil then are clearly stand alone and independent of God if there is a God.

Believers however argue, "God exists therefore evil does not contradict the existence of God." They admit it might but they say it might not. Let us forget the fact that we have seen that it does contradict it.

But to say evil might fit God is to deny that evil is a power so they say evil is merely a level of good that is too low. So God only makes good but sometimes good falls short. So that avoids having God blamed for making evil. If that doctrine is all true then they are lying if they say evil might refute God. How can it when it is defined in a way to fit God? Why is there so much religious muddying of the waters and messing around?

Messing around is bad for it is refusing to see if evil contradicts the existence of God then that it does. Refusing to recognise evil as it is is a marker of evil itself. It feeds evil for it prevents a proper diagnosis and there is therefore no hope of a good treatment. Nobody does enough to stop more bad things happening. Why are you not doing more and engaging in more sacrifices? Is it because you have that doctrine of evil lurking in you even if you do not see it?

Others suffer from evil more than you the believer ever will – you are one person and there are and have been billions. And what about animals? What business have you to water down the indescribable evil they endured by redefining it as a faulty form of good? What kind of person are you?

A truly good person if they cannot find an answer for evil needs to admit there might not be one so that they will try to be an answer by being good and kind to the extreme. They will step in where God should be but is not. They will do what God should do but cannot do for he is not there.

If God is a good thing then suffering puts us off him so suffering is evil in that sense.

Evil cannot be a tool for doing a greater good or a source of a worthwhile good. It is not possible. The good that comes from it is only part of how evil looks good. It is a reason for condemning the evil - it is the biggest reason!

The argument that evil fits God is evil for it pretends to be an argument. It is not an argument at all but a trick.

The argument that evil is an argument for God is even worse.

If it is reasonable to deny God on the basis of the existence of evil and suffering then that reasonableness is itself evil if

God in fact does exist. Thus to see that God by definition is a threat to reason so the logical argument from evil against God can only be correct and good.

### *Blaming God or declaring him responsibility*

God as creator, maker of all things out of nothing, has to be the only one ultimately in control. How could it be otherwise when a sparrow cannot drop dead without his consent? Matthew 10:29. Even the hairs of our head are numbered (Luke 12:7). Though people may distinguish between blame and responsibility, they do not want to believe that God is more responsible for the evil choices of a villain or monster than the person themselves. Why? Everything is so dependent on God that your bit hardly counts. It is like comparing a grain of sand to the universe. Actually that is no comparison. The lack of horror in believers shows a lack of empathy when the role of God in evil is so huge. Human nature hates anybody being even indirectly responsible for grave evil. The love given to God is definitely given to an imagined version of God and believers are opposed to the real thing if there is one. Even if there is no God they intend to be opposed to God. They want their sanitised incoherent version. Logical arguments from evil against God cannot be refuted simply because believers are abusing the definition of God.

### *Not an assuming matter*

Those who deny that evil is intolerable to an all-good God taken on a very heavy burden of proof. They need to prove compatibility more than they need to prove anything. Evil is of extreme importance. They do not take the burden.

The assumption that evil fits a perfectly good God is intrinsically evil. The belief that evil fits a perfectly good God is intrinsically evil too but worse. To claim to KNOW they are compatible is infinitely worse. To understand this try the following, "The assumption that molesting toddlers fits being a perfectly good father is intrinsically evil. The belief that molesting toddlers fits being a perfectly good father is intrinsically evil too but worse. To claim to KNOW they are compatible is infinitely worse." The reason assuming is not as bad as believing is that the latter involves claiming evidence supports the compatibility. But not everything that evidence points to should be believed. If evidence pointed to eating blue berries as a cure for cancer it would have to be dismissed for evidence that points to stupidity is self-defeating.

### *Man has no business defining evil if there is a God*

God cannot let humanity define evil or trust humanity with the correct definition if he reveals it to them for humanity cannot see evil as God sees it. Only a God can understand what evil is and means. Humanity has only a partial understanding. How much each person understands depends on how much they can or want to understand. And often one person simply cannot understand as much as the next person.

Another trick is the way evil is singular. In fact evil is a set of myriad evils. Strictly speaking there is no evil only evils. And if some evils can fit a God it does not follow that all can. In that light, we have no right to take the risk of saying that all evils fit God for we cannot know and understand and experience and test all evils. It is evil to take the risk. Thus the argument that evils fit God is evil itself and thus proves the success of the logical argument against God.

### *No need for God and if there is a need it is not much*

Good is a part of God or what God is all about. So believers tell us.

If there is a good God he can direct us if we hail good but fail to understand that it is part of God. Thus in that light being atheist should not stop you being a child and instrument of God without you knowing it. The trouble is that when somebody plots evil they talk themselves into it by thinking about the good side of it.

### *Agnosticism*

God is used to explain good and to explain evil in the sense that evil is seen as good that is in the wrong place and time for God is untouched by evil. We have no idea how a mind without a body works on itself or on anything else so trying to use God as an explanation for anything fails. The only truth is to admit that if there is a God then you don't know it or what it means.

To believe you cannot know if there is a God or not o.

### *Finally*

The logical argument that a really good God cannot be all-good and all-powerful and allow unjust evil or any evil is correct. It is also good. God is not only philosophically disproven but proven to be a toxic doctrine. Let us end by saying

that the suggestion that evil may fit or fits a perfectly good God is intrinsically evil for God and evil are logically opposed.