

WHY THE EVIL THAT IS DOWN TO PURELY NATURAL CAUSES MAKES GOD'S LOVE A RIDICULOUS AND EVEN CRUEL THING TO BELIEVE IN

Main Points:

Religion says that God acting in an unloving way or immoral way does not mean he cannot let earthquakes and plagues happen. The latter are natural evils not moral ones.

It needs to prove that but it merely says it is possible that such evils can be put up with by a loving God. But we need strong evidence or it needs to be obvious. To settle for less makes us morally evil! We would be saying it lightly that a good God can maybe set up a lab and make bad viruses in it or authorise us to do so.

If there is no plan in nature and it just happens then normal is only in our heads and if there is no normal there is no morality.

It is dishonest to blame free will for evil when we refuse to say, "Maybe nature or God is evil or maybe not" when we seen an earthquake killing little children.

Natural evil just happens but religion believes that God is responsible for all as maker of all from nothing so there is no just happens.

MORE THOUGHTS

The evil religion condemns is moral evil - evil that some person does. They do not condemn a God allowing natural evils such as disease. They say that is not moral evil. That is playing with words. If we made diseases they would be saying it is moral evil. They make an exception of God which is unfair and amounts to saying God is an exception just because THE say so. You can't get out of it by saying God said it. That is a further insult. It is different if you can prove God said it. You would blame God or saying it anyway. God being all-good and all-powerful and creator does not imply that he can let disasters happen if he so chooses. If God wants a relationship with us then he will meet us as an equal even if he is not. Not being an equal does not mean he cannot act as one. It is already settled natural evil is moral evil if there is a God. Natural evil is just a bad random event if there is not. An earthquake is a moral matter if God makes and does it. It is not evil if there is no God but is evil if there is.

Moral evil is said to be parasitic on good - evil is simply good that is not good enough or which goes too far. It is not a thing but a lack of something that should be there. Moral evil is also parasitic on natural evils - defined as evil that nobody does.

It is a natural evil that we can be very good and it can make us miserable - nature does not guarantee happiness in return for the good you do. So natural evil instead of being for or allowing for moral good is against it. In that sense, it does not matter if natural evil is not moral evil - what matters is that it fuels it.

Those who say the problem of a loving creator God letting evil exist and happen and hurt people is solved by his judging evil first hand and then acting as appropriate to respond to it and prevent it from getting more power than it need have. If you cannot judge say a plague for it is not a person or what a person is doing you judge it in the sense, "If I could judge you I would." Your attitude then to natural evil says something about you so religion has no right to say it is okay for it is not down to the action of any person.

Our right to identify harms is more important than anything else even bread. So for that reason nature itself programs us to oppose and damn natural evil. Natural evil asks for firmer opposition to it than to moral evil.

Some religious people claim that things like killer diseases or earthquakes that kill children are not evils. They are just part of nature. They just happen. Some atheists say the same thing.

It does not make sense for both sides to be saying that. One side after all holds that nature is made by God from totally nothing so it is really God acting not nature. The other holds that nature is just there and just a thing and for that reason those things are not evils.

The religious then are being callously dismissive. Its evil of them.

What about the logic behind saying that diseases are not evil? The logic is that evil is only evil if something is responsible for it. Evil is important. Responsibility is more important than evil for without it there is no such thing.

To do evil for a good purpose is evil but not forbidden evil. It is required evil. But it is still evil and the rule with justified evil is that you cannot be rewarded for it but have to be called to account.

Thus God should not be worshipped even if his evil is justified. He is not really worshipped for being good but for triumphing over evil. God is not about goodness so much as being a weapon.

It is a fundamentally passive-aggressive subject and thus you cannot talk about natural evil and say its nothing to do with moral evil. What you think of it says something about you. That is what we are trying to say.

God sins when he engineers earthquakes etc?

God creating earthquakes and engineering them are two different things. Create is about where the forces that do earthquakes come from. Engineer is about what God does with the material he has made.

A man who designs and sends earthquakes would be evil but a man who creates the forces that earthquake is also making the earthquake deliberately out of nothing. He is worse.

Religion says God allowing earthquakes and terrible plagues does not mean God sins and argues that as sin is so bad that God would never sin. So it is better to be crushed under rocks by accident than to hit somebody. God approves of natural disaster compared to sin. If you believe in God then you are automatically saying that such evil is not really evil. Some say its neither good or bad which is the same as saying it is half and half. The only recourse is to say that it is as good as healthy waters and lovely landscapes. That is the psychopath way. You are saying that the earthquake is fine and you would send it on people if it were up to you. You consent to what nature does and that says something about you.

God's Image

The Bible and the Christian faith say we are made in God's image. Therefore if that means anything at all then if we are repelled by evil in the universe God must be even more repelled. So God making natural evil would prove that we are not in God's image or that God does not exist. Religion says a God who does not make us in his image is a distant God and not good for us or our moral progression. It all connects - natural evil cannot be separated from how it impacts on moral evil. The notion that it has to be regarded as just natural and something a good God can do for the real problem is sin does not hold water.

The question, is all evil down to factors God does not control and can he be good and make terrible diseases? Natural evil is not an accident if there is a God. Those who say it fits God are thinking of it as an accident and that makes no sense. Natural evil may not be moral evil but it certainly is "would-be moral evil." It does not get off the hook just because it is not like a sin or crime. Evil by definition is that which would be worse if it could be even if that means being immoral.

Free will and evil

Christians say God is perfectly good and harmless and never encourages immorality in the slightest so if evil exists it must be down to human beings abusing their free will. That is the free will defence.

Why free will cannot be considered part of natural evil too is not explained!

The biggest and most lasting suffering is not down to human doing. It is natural evil that has nothing to do with anybody.

Christians claim that even that evil fits belief in God! To pretend that free will makes sense of evil is dishonest when they would still justify God if there were no free will. They would be okay with evil in a world where only cats and dogs exist and rip each other to bits. Not only is their argument wrong but worthy of condemnation and it is so shamelessly dishonest that the dishonesty is often unnoticed - some things are so unbelievably shameless that they go right over your head. They are more okay with terrible suffering due to disease than with moral evil. Again that is sanctimonious and disgraceful.

We don't really see nature as something that is permitted to harm!

You may say, "If something is just random or chance then its fair. It is fair for it just happens and can happen to anybody." Another may say, "Fairness is nothing to do with it."

Yet that is not how we view things. We do not say its fair if pure chance is the reason that a child gets caught up in a wave and is drowned.

Fairness is not as much about free will or what somebody has chosen to do as it is about wanting people to be happy and well. Fairness is about us imposing our values on nature. We are part of nature so you could see us as the moral part of nature that imposes our values on the rest.

Natural evil is the issue that makes what we do with our free will a non-issue in comparison. The magnitude and randomness of it show that! How we see it and our so-called free will do in fact have a relationship that we are about to explore.

Moral and Natural-Physical Evil can be the Same!!

Moral evils and physical evils are distinguished by believers.

Let us ignore the assumption that free will evil is not itself another kind of natural evil.

(So in actual fact, they are at least sometimes the same.)

When you hurt somebody deliberately it is natural evil that you use to do it and it not you is the reason the damage is permanent. Natural evil is the biggest problem here. Natural evil is what you inflict when you gouge out the other's eye but natural evil does the real harm. Condemnations of what you have done deny this and are more personal than the "love the sinner not the sin - hate the sin" brigade would have you believe.

Nature has enabled us to wage war with terrible weapons. That is an example of the two working together. Why does religion ignore that? Because it wants natural or physical evil to look as if it just happens and does not mean somebody wants to hurt us or does not care. God co-operates with the bad person and does natural evil to aid that person. Natural evil is bad for it gives the message, "God uses evil to do good no matter how much it looks like there is no good in it." Thus it permits and leads to people thinking they can do harm for God's job is to turn it to good. Natural evil cannot be treated then as a separate issue from human evil. Human nature sees natural evil as proper evil and whoever says they do not is a liar. The doctrine accuses them of being evil. Again natural evil and human evil are linked and there is no excuse for trying to say the former is permissible. If physical evil is bad so is moral evil.

Natural and moral evil are one for natural evil has programmed a response to natural evil in us. No matter what theologians say about the good side of earthquakes and so on being the side that matters deep down we all know deep down that we are trying to be okay with evil and with a God who may exist and who is making diseases to inflict on little babies. The vast majority of people, if not all, do lump natural and moral evil together perhaps in a simplistic way. They see volcanoes as evil. It is alarming that they would worship a God they believe is responsible for natural evil. It is undeniable that those who deny they do that are in denial and do not see that they actually do. This is not about it being true or false that natural harm is bad. It is about how we inherently see it.

Natural evil naturally leads believers to argue that it is better for people to die in earthquakes than to be murdered! So the very reason for condemning murder in the first place is abandoned! Belief is evil, cruel and judgemental.

To make it clear:

Creation means that God makes condoms in factories. Saying the workers do it is fine but it is not accurate and we have to use that kind of talk to avoid confusion. It is not meant to be precise if there is a God. It is practical. So God sings when the pop star sings. He is far more the cause than the workers or the pop star. It may not look like he is directly doing it but indirect does not necessarily imply he is not fully involved. He is more involved than they are. Indirect can be as strong or stronger than direct. He uses them to make condoms and sing. If he is that involved in human action then he is more involved then in things that just happen. Or is he? No creating is just creating and causing is just causing. The murder is as much God's doing as the creation of a new disease is.

If what you choose is your creation and you are really all-self made then your virtue is declared independent of God so you intend to create good regardless of what he thinks. It is arrogant defiance of God. It is however a virtue for it is reaching out to people not God. But then if you are self-made there is no God! True but that is not the point. It is still intending defiance of God if there is one.

Accept?

It makes no sense to tell people to accept the natural evils they cannot change such as meteorites crashing into the earth and

wiping out cities and to tell them they don't have to accept the behaviour of others towards them. They cannot change others any more than they can deflect the killer superbug. People are comforted by religion and its refusal to admit how terrible natural evil is. The sugarcoating is manipulative in the extreme.

It is important that we abhor belief in God and the teachings about natural evil being good enough to be engineered by God out of sheer compassion.

Accepting is one thing. Embracing is another. It is a wonder they don't tell you to embrace the evil when it cannot be avoided.

Speeding

The evil of a man driving too fast and risking his life is bad and evil because of the potential to lose his life.

It is evil yes but you would not ask for him to be condemned with moral outrage or punished. The evil is in the situation not the person.

This example proves that if nature can do non-moral evil so can people!

You see too that justice and punishment are not truly about concern for people but for order of a cherry-picked variety. People want enough order and orderliness but not as much as they should want.

Free will and moral evil are problematic so you cannot blame any evil on them

Moral evil is controversial so natural evil should be MORE controversial. If there is no free will or if it plays a tiny part in what we do then all or most of the evil we do is natural evil as well. Free will may give birth to how you use your fists to hurt people but natural evil does most of the work. Your free will did not give you the strength and the knuckles. Plus when we do right or wrong there will be unintended results direct and indirect that may be harmful. Even if we have free choice and misuse it there is a lot more to evil than misusing it. We rage against evil choice when we see the damage so it is not choice that matters so much as the harm done. So it is not natural for us to affirm that natural evil is not so vile that it confutes the doctrine that God loves us.

It cannot be shown that free will is logically possible or real. So free will amounts to a guess. If it is real then guessing it is all about a yes or to God is a guess. If free will is a guess that version of free will is a bigger one!

A man with free will who thinks he could be drugged to do things has no proper free will so free will requires that you know it is working and that you have it. But you do not know. You have the right to do evil of your own free will and say you didn't know you had free will and thus evade responsibility. Free will is supposed to be given by God because he wants us to freely decide if we will be immoral or moral. But what use is it with the loophole? To see it as a gift is to insult goodness never mind God.

Our problems with detecting free will, the power to do moral evil, are natural evils so natural evil is the bigger deal than moral evil.

Sufferer becomes a means not an end

God belief forces believers to use the suffering of others so they can be grateful for the good side.

People talk about their faith in this God who brings good out of natural evil. Examples. There would be no brave people if there were no human savages. There would be no good doctors if there were no terrible diseases. There would be no aeroplanes to go to Gran Canaria if people didn't die when aviation was finding itself. It goes on and on.

This is putting value on human good intentions and nothing else. The good that is concentrated on is only good intention wise. It is not good any other way and has NOT THE SLIGHTEST THING WITH SHOWING THE SITUATION OUGHT TO HAPPEN. It is good to be brave if there is nothing else you can do and the situation really is down to blind forces completely and ultimately. Believers end up being almost happy that cancer exists so that nurses may grow in virtue! Many believers clearly are!! Would the pope give a kidney to save somebody with kidney cancer? It never crosses his mind!

If it is good to develop a bad disease as long as nobody is doing it to you (including you!) and it is just blind nature that totally violates what we mean by good. Bad has nothing to do with whether a person is doing it or it is just happening.

You cannot brag that there is no compassion or courage without serious illness for that is you taking the attitude: "Little

Mary suffers and screams. I choose to see the good in it." You use her to see the allegedly good side. You use her pain to tell yourself it ought to be.

Placebo

Natural evil is terrifying and we know if it is going to happen there is nothing we can do. The help that comes from God amounts to him helping us be more virtuous or brave in the face of such evil. That is supposed to compensate for the evil! We are using the thought as a placebo to deal with our horror of natural evil. That is the reason we justify it. That is the only reason. But what right have you to make the suffering of others which is far beyond your own a placebo? It is not about you. It is not an opportunity for you to find a way to dull the horror and filth of natural evil.