

THE MYSTERY OF EVIL BEING TOLERATED BY GOD COMES FROM OUR PSYCHOLOGY NOT FAITH AND NOT RELIGION THOUGH THEY TAKE IT FROM PSYCHOLOGY

You don't want to see how terrible an evil was. To help you forget you may rationalise it. If you can do this for the suffering of another you can feel less needed. We endlessly rationalise that something we did or suffered at least was what it was and was not worse. This is a fallacy for what if you reason that at least when you murdered John you didn't murder Joan as well? It is being pro-evil but up to a point and making it look excusable.

How can an all-good God refuse to use his power to protect us from evil? Not only are we talking about the evil of disease and famine but also about how he lets evil people - who take away the free will of others by hurting them - do so much harm? Is the evil people's free will more important than that of the victims?

Theodicy is the attempt to show that an all-good God can still allow evil things to happen without becoming evil or amoral. It is always about trying to show there is no contradiction. The hypocrisy of that approach is clear for nobody argues that the existence of evil is an indication that God exists or demands the existence of God. If there is an all-good God it is not enough to show that God does not contradict the existence of evil, what we need is to prove that God needs evil to exist to be a good God! You might show that Johnny the Paedophile down the road molesting children does not prove that he is a bad person at heart. But reconciling his alleged goodness with the harm he does does not mean that he really is good at heart. You don't know - you cannot prove it. It is a stronger endorsement of Johnny to say that his molesting children proves that he is a good person. If God is all-good then he needs the strongest endorsement possible. So far we see that there is no hope of a theodicy working. It defeats its own purpose. It cannot inspire us to be godlike by teaching us something about evil and dealing with it.

Religionists commonly, but not always, preach that the solution to the problem of evil exists but is undiscovered. They are right that having no answer is not necessarily proof that none exists but this does not apply in this case. We know what good and evil are and if there is a possible answer we would have found it ages ago. Some of the modern responses to the theodicies are improvements on old anti-god arguments. The old ones were good and sufficient. But the new ones are so good and carefully thought out that they force us to admit that the evidence against the existence of God is conclusive.

Religion still trots out the discredited theodicies for they know the congregation is not into deep thinking. So they easily think a God allowing evil to happen for a greater good makes sense. Or that it is a mystery - the mystery argument is good for stopping awkward questions. This is disgraceful and manipulative for it is oversimplifying something so major and important. That is an insult to children dying in agony from cancer.

Good is simply doing what is best for others. If God is wise and good then he always does good. His general purposes would not be that puzzling but his individual ones would be for we don't know the whole picture. For example, if it made sense to believe that God sends suffering to prevent worse suffering we would be able to trust him say when your baby dies tragically in sickness. So we would have the general reason but we would not know exactly why the baby was taken. But the general reasons make no sense. Not one if the reasons that allow for the possibility of God being right to let evil happen work. They all deny that God really lets evil thrive - it only seems to and that makes them evil if evil is thriving. Evil is fed by misdiagnosis.

When a man tortures babies to death we do not say that he does it for a mysterious and perhaps supernatural general purpose that makes him innocent but perhaps misguided. But we are more entitled to say that about the man than about God who is more straightforward and less complex. The teaching that suffering and evil are mysteries in the general sense is evil for this reason. It is depraved to excuse God instead of the man who is more entitled to it. Perhaps God does not want us to judge - accuse or thank - others at all? Then that would mean that God is against the law of the land and against forgiveness which cannot be done without judging first. That would make life a misery. God could enable us to know if a person was guilty or not. He could tell us or help us to make a foolproof lie detector that also restores the bad person's memory where necessary.

It is evil to excuse the behaviour of a being whose existence you cannot really and rationally be as sure of as the existence of an evil and cruel person. If you believe in God then you have to believe that it is best to excuse the evil and cruel person. The being that is more likely to exist should get the best treatment and that is your neighbour.

The doctrine that evil is a mystery is itself evil. If evil is a mystery then God is fictitious and an abomination.

If God's good looks like evil then God or anybody can use this to persuade us that anything evil is really good. It makes

slaves of us though religion lies to us and says that God has made us his sons.

Believers in God stated, "It is a mystery how a perfectly good God can remain good while letting evil thrive. The possibility that it is about respecting our free will, punishment, chastisement, helping us to see the horror of evil so that we will recoil from it or that we appreciate good better if we experience evil go some way to helping us understand but they only help a bit. Overall it is a mystery." In reality this argument shows embarrassment. The believers are ashamed to say it is a mystery. If it is a mystery then there is no point in trying to say the theodicies help us reach understanding to some degree. It is contradictory. If we think belief in free will helps a little bit that does not mean it really does or that it is even slightly the reason. It is callous to put forward mystery as an excuse while you find it embarrassing. It is insulting to go out of your way to suggest that suffering might be punishment or discipline from God. That is what you are doing when you say it is a mystery and that those suggestions help a little. Its rude and disrespectful to sufferers most of whom will suffer more than you may ever experience or understand. It is easy for you in your relative comforts to judge the suffering of others as agreeable with the goodness of God.

The believer in God wishes to see evil as a mystery. That means there is no point in speculating as to why God lets so many bad things happen. The believer prioritises worshipping and praising God over assessing the suffering of others and its meaning. The believer is like the neighbour who sees the children being beaten up by the family next door and who tells herself or himself that it is right for some unknown reason so it is best to leave it. It is really about putting her or his own happiness before anybody else. Today's individualism is rooted in the poison sowed by religion in the past.

All religionists argue that since God's goodness is infinite we cannot understand it. That is why it often seems daft to us. All religionists who see that evil cannot be explained take refuge in this theory. But this really means that God's goodness is different to what our reason says is goodness. Our reason is said to be wrong because it is not intelligent enough. But how could goodness be infinite if there is so much of it that it becomes evil? An infinite line is still a line. Infinite space is still space. Infinite good must still be goodness. Infinite good means unlimitedly perfect goodness so if we understand what goodness is at all we should be able to understand what is good and what is evil.

If you say evil is a mystery and God exists then you are saying that you do not believe in God because of what you see on earth but because of Jesus' say-so or habit or authority or something. This translates thus: "I don't care what suffering says. I ignore it and don't care for the sake of belief. I want to believe in what Jesus said or what the pope said and that is all I care about". With that attitude you could only make yourself feel sorry for others not because you are really concerned for them but because you want to trick yourself into feeling compassion for them so that you can pat yourself on your back.

Even those who say that suffering is punishment for sin or is only allowed to happen so that we can improve ourselves as people by correcting the damage are still saying that evil is a mystery. You have people who reject all the answers they can come up with to explain how evil does not contradict the goodness and power of God. You have people who accept these answers but who say that in individual cases nobody can be sure what answer applies. Both sides are united in their contention that you cannot tell sufferer x why she or he is suffering. It is human nature to need an answer. Religion lets them down when they need it. The God belief lets them down.

Believers in evil being a mystery sometimes say that their belief is justified and reasonable because all they are doing is looking at the goodness of God and of believing in him so that they don't need an explanation for evil.

Perhaps we should start with the good in life and say it points to the existence of a good God. That is exclusive and insulting to people who are very very sick or depressed. They are excluded from this method. They won't be good at seeing the good. In fact, encouraging them to use the method is only going to inflict worse misery on them not to mention guilt.

The God concept should lead to those who suffer terribly and whose spirits are very low to fear that they deserve their suffering. Religion may tell them that they can't be sure that God is punishing them but it will have to admit that he could be. At best they can say the chance is small. But it is still a chance.

If God punishes then if he loves us he will tell us. That is telling depressed people who feel they are being punished that they are in fact correct!

And suppose God is hurting a person to help make that person more compassionate and holy. He could have chosen this method because the person deserves it. Or he could be hurting a person for no reason than just because they deserve it. Or he might choose to hurt them in a way that helps them and regards the hurtful side of this as what they deserve. In other words, he could help them without hurting them so bad but he decides to use a more brutal method of helping them on the grounds that they deserve it. The Bible plainly teaches that God punishes or gives people the evil they deserve.

If you see evil as a mystery then you cloud your view of good and evil. If you say God letting suffering happen is a mystery then his goodness must be a mystery too. I mean that if you pray for sunshine and it arrives, you cannot be sure if it was

granted because it was good or for some mysterious greater good.

Some supporters of mystery argue that we regard evil as a mystery because good is not a mystery and that we see enough good to allow us to trust that the bad can be explained at least in the next life. This is a view that can only be taken by a person who has seen or experienced enough good. And that will differ from person to person. People will say that it may take a lifetime and that there is nothing wrong with that. But there is. If there is good, the person who takes a long time to see it is a bad person until then. He or she is too jaded or negative and selfish and blind. When explained properly, the mystery doctrine is an insult to those who do not see the good as justifying the mysterious evil hypothesis. It is in violation of the rule that religious belief should never put anybody at risk of unnecessary offence or harm.

Back to this good in life that entitles us to turn a blind eye to the evil and flippantly dismiss it as a mystery. What good should we start with? The beauty of nature? Or some other non-human good? Or should we start with the goodness in human nature? Or both? Definitely the goodness in human nature for it should show what God is like better than anything else would. It is the personal touch. But this method excludes those who have lived and are living awful horrendous lives at the hands of others. And goodness is about rules that must be kept irrespective of the consequences or it is about doing whatever has the best results. The problem with rules is that people pick what rules they want to keep and ignore the ones they don't like. For example, the pope makes it absolute law that you must not have sex outside marriage no matter how much good it would do. And he lets you eat animals despite the horrendous conditions in which they are treated not as creations of God but as objects to be slaughtered for food. And the problem with consequences is that we only predict and guess what they will be. You can get married because you have weighed it up that it is for the best and step into pure hell. We only guess what is good. Even if there is objective good, we still have to guess about what it is. If people want to believe in God because they want to be good then they need to see that the best they can do is guess. And you don't need belief in God to do that! The Church has brainwashed people to imagine that belief in God helps them to be good. If you believe God letting evil happen is a mystery and you consider this belief to be good for your morals and your spirituality it is for nothing. In reality you are justifying going out of your way to praise God for letting evil happen for his mysterious purpose. You are justifying the unjustifiable.

Christians are to love God for being what he is and not what they think he should be. Clearly the mystery doctrine comes hand in hand with God. If it is evil then so is belief in God.

If we are as prone to sin as religion says and often let God down through weakness, is it not vulgar for us to decree that God allows evil to happen and it is a mystery? That is because it is coming from unholy entities like us. It is more likely to be down to us wanting to think it than it is about us wanting to be correct.

The utter incoherence of love the sinner and hate the sin, the doctrine that is behind the theory of a good God and a good Jesus and the goodness of Christianity, proves that the mystery idea is not even to be considered. Christians are to love God for being what he is and not what they think he should be. God by definition is the being who knows best and does best. Loving sinners is supposed to be about loving them for what they are and not for what you think they should be. In other words you ignore the sin and even tell yourself that there is no sin in them at all! This is contradicted then by your calling them sinners and calling them opponents of holiness and the law of God and the perfect love of God. So you love them for the perfect people they are. If you partly hate the sinner and claim to mostly love them then you do not love them at all. You fail to love the persons for what they are and not for what you think they should be. Love the sinner and hate the sin only impresses those who do not really understand love. Those who preach the principle are propagating saccharinised evil.

Believers in evil as a mystery are so stubborn that if you prove to them that the God concept hurts people they will just rationalise that this hurt is justified even if we don't know how it could be. It is hurting people when you refuse to see that the evil they suffer is without any possible justification. In fact by saying that evil is justified though they cannot have any reason for thinking it can be, so there must be a mysterious reason, is agreeing with the evil. It dismisses the fact that even if you do not know exactly why suffering is sent that you at least should be sure it is possible that it is sent for good reasons. Claiming that if there are no good reasons you can think of, there must be at least one and it is a mystery is indecent. Just as a person is innocent until found guilty so suffering should be deemed terrible and useless until reasons are found that might justify a God letting it be.