

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

Religion says God is pure harmlessness and love. That does not fit how he has set up plagues and earthquakes and natural evils that cannot be blamed on human free will. A human person will worry more about somebody having cancer than them having a vice such as gambling. To worry more about such moral evils is itself a moral evil if there is a God!

Our attitude to natural evil says something about the kind of people we are and the kind of God we worship. We will contend that the notion that natural evil fits God and even glorifies him is disgraceful.

Religion says God wants us all to have only good but it says we rejected that offer. This is implicitly saying that accidental evil, natural evil that is not down to somebody doing it and the suffering of animals is wrong. It is so wrong that free agents are to blame. But those things still happen when free will is not involved! What about that? Blaming free will assumes that rebels against God make evil and apart from that there is no evil. But there is. Religion does not have the nerve to pretend that the evils in nature we mentioned are goods. That would be sick.

The attempts to make out that natural evil is not a moral matter for its nobody's fault not even God's need to stop talking about natural evil and use the word accident instead. The bottom line is that if there is a God then there are no accidents.

We have learned that natural evil is unjustly ignored though it gets lip treatment and is ignored to make us feel responsible for the devastation around us. We have learned that the problem is not natural evil but how religion is so unjust to us. The injustice is condoned by the very idea of a loving God.

IN DEPTH EXAMINATION

Natural evil, non-moral evil, is really evil and proves there is no God. It cannot be blamed on free will. It just happens and has nothing to do with what people do. Plus natural evil influences and tempts the free agent to harm for natural evil teaches you that you can harm. So natural evil cannot be neatly separated from moral evil. They are intertwined/

The free will excuse for evil does not explain natural evil at all. And it is so serious that it needs good explaining.

The Christians have replies to the thesis that natural evil is proof or satisfactory evidence that God is nonsense. The Christians keep saying that God is not acting immorally by sending earthquakes and plagues. Its not that kind of evil if evil at all is the word.

Christian Assertion: We allow that natural evil might disprove God. But to say natural evil possibly refutes God is to admit it possibly might not. Faith takes us down the latter road.

Answer: Faith is not an answer in a matter that is so serious. Faith is a part of nature for nature makes all creatures go about as if danger cannot happen.

Natural evil should be stated to definitely disprove God because it is a serious matter. It is not a matter of possibility. And a faith based on possibility is a thin faith. It is really guesswork not faith. Guesswork is making religion about you when it is not about you. It is idolatrous and leads to religious hypocrisy.

Christian Assertion: Natural evil is a different subject from moral evil. We should believe because of the divine appeal that we avoid moral evil. That is what matters most. Let God worry about why natural evil has to happen.

Answer: Those who believe the Christians tend to forget that natural evil is more than diseases and death and earthquakes and includes our human weakness. It is natural weakness.

Do not forget either that all religions recognise you can hate people against your will and they deny this is a sin as long as you keep trying to overcome it. No religion has the right to claim that it opposes hate for that is a lie. It has an exception. Hate in that case would be seen as a natural evil. The lie itself gives it no right to be taken seriously when it bans violence and helps explain why religionists who wish to turn violent feel happy to do it in the name of their faith.

If the Christians are right that proving God endorses a moral evil would show he is unworthy of being acknowledged as God then surely a God who programmes you to hate though it is not your fault is equally vile. It would be insane to reject

God if you could prove he told a boy to cheat in his homework and to love him if he programmes people to hate against their will!! It makes you morally evil for preferring the latter to the sin of cheating. The doctrine of natural evil fitting the love of almighty God is itself morally evil implicitly and often explicitly!!

Christian Assertion: Natural evil, or much of it, is done by evil and violence loving spirits such as Satan. The Bible says so (Job 1:16, 19; 2:7; Mark 9:20; Luke 13:10-16; Matthew 17:14-15).

Answer: That gives Satan and his minions godlike powers but there is only one God of love. It is a fearful doctrine. The pagans believed the gods were beings who may be governed by a monarch god but they had power to change nature magically or supernaturally. The Christian doctrine is polytheistic. The doctrine is not so good if it leads to too many people flirting with those demons and doing evil to make bargains with them.

Jesus said that whoever sins is a slave to sin and spoke of sin as if it had abilities and so on. If so Satan the top sinner is the biggest slave of all! This really turns sin into a sort of abstract but very real god or God!

Christian Assertion: Let us remember the most important thing that if natural evil hurts you and kills your loved ones that God grieves with you.

Answer: A dodge.

And we are vulnerable not God. It cannot be the same for God. You are the one that feels there is no hope and how can you have rapport with a God who stands for hope and who infers that there is something wrong with you for not being able to hope? If you feel God suffers and grieves with you it will fade away with the cold light of day. God cannot really grieve if you lose a loved one in a volcanic eruption when he has saved that person by taking her to the afterlife to enjoy a lovely and eternal existence.

Suffering people may often attend Church a bit but there is not the same demand on Church and worship and on clergy as there would be on therapists. That says something. It is more like they seek help from the Church but it is only their trying to complement the real help they get.

I think it is fair to say that this objection is the most important one. It tries to tackle the core problem: that saying God does natural evil seems to make him unloving.

If the feeling that God grieves with us is a natural one then it is a natural evil itself unless God is inspiring it. It is not nature's place to speak for God.

Christian Assertion: Natural evil is an opportunity for us to be better and bigger than it. It is only tolerated by God because it helps us to mature spiritually.

Answer: This one is far from humble and respectful of nature. You will never be stronger than natural evil. Natural evil by definition is not about helping us. We can help ourselves to face it and live through it. The Christians are insulting us.

The argument assumes that God permits natural evil to happen but hates it. But there is more than just letting it happen going on. The word permit or tolerate doesn't make sense for it is God who is almighty we are talking about! If God makes nature it has no say in what it does but he does.

Do not forget that to say it is okay for it is just a contradiction and as long as people don't start praising evil for God does it who cares? But a contradiction is never a solution. It is nothing.

Christian Assertion: Natural evils are not really evils for if the dinosaurs had not been killed in some natural disaster we might not be here.

Answer: Then why not rejoice when a lion dismembers a child? Or why not just not care one way or the other? If it is not evil then it is good or it does not matter what it is. The reply is stolen by the Christians it would seem. It seems atheistic to use that reply. It does not fit the notion of a loving supernatural God.

People tend to be very bad in secret when they are sure they will not get caught so you might be surprised at how many prophets and saints and so on gloated. They wanted to believe in God for some reason so why should it be a good reason?

Belief in God is believed to be such a great good that if you had a gun to your head and had to choose one of these beliefs, "I must be happy with the dismembering of babies by lions rather than condemn God for being responsible" or "I hate the dismembering of babies even if it means hating God." One loves God for his involvement and the other is open to hating

him - though it does not actually hate. It is obvious what nature itself would "want" you to choose. It is obvious that to be human you must be willing to be sickened by the babies suffering even if it means hating God.

Christian Assertion: Natural evil is not about trying to cause hurt but is a system that can go wrong. William Lane Craig suggests that plate tectonics do good for us though they can risk earthquakes and earthquakes do happen. He said God just simply had to create a world with them and it is not God's fault.

Answer: That is actually a denial that God is all powerful for a God that has to set up such a system contradicts the doctrine that God is almighty and thus does not have to do things any particular way. Thus Craig sees earthquakes as by products of a good thing. So clearly suffering and death are by products of earthquakes as well. Why not say that death is the by product of the suffering? Why not say death and murder are good things? Why not diminish how intolerable they are by saying they are just by products?

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 or to go to wealthy nations that have the equipment to tell you an earthquake will not happen. 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. It implies that those who suffer have themselves to blame for ignoring God's warning. You can blame people for living in a city next a volcano. Or you can say God is using nature to give them a sign that they should not live there. The two are not the same thing and the latter is a very judgemental thing to say. One is blaming human error and risktaking but that is not a moral failing like ignoring God's warning and going ahead to live and risk yourself and others by living in a deadly place.

The idea of God doing many terrible things in nature so that Donald Trump can be rich and well does not sit well with anybody.

Christian Assertion: God makes you feel that bad things in nature exist and ought not to happen. That proves it is a mystery why he lets them happen but he asks to come to him for help to battle them.

Answer: Mystery is often an euphemism for contradiction or nonsense. It is a disguise. A person who settles for mystery needs to do more than just tell you they believe it is a mystery. They need to verify that they really think that but they never do. Thus they are flippant and irresponsible in the face of so much human suffering.

Christian Assertion: We observe that those who suggest that natural evil proves there is no loving God think that God should show his love it seems by creating only a good world. That is what they think. But he did that and we came along and destroyed his work.

Answer: At least this is an admission that natural evil is really evil and abhorrent. But they will not admit that there is no point in blaming free will for a really good world should be able to bounce back to what it was after evil lays it waste.

Christian Assertion: The assumption that all should be great for us presupposes that morality is only about avoiding harm or not doing harm. Morality is about the kind of person you are. The harm is a result of you being a person who harbours vice inside such as hate and envy etc.

Answer: Harm then is a symptom of evil rather than evil. This implies that your intentions matter rather than the harm. The end result is a form of hypocrisy called moralism. It is not morality.

It is not even one coin with two sides. Virtue on the one and respect for harmlessness on the other. But what if it were. One side and not the other may be what matters to one. For the atheist, it is the harm done and God can take a running jump as can faith in him. For the believer, it is about how God is against the harm for he is so good so it is about God not the person who is hurt. Clearly only the atheist can have a decent attitude.

The Christians are trying to make out that atheists just care about debunking God's care and providence and don't really have any concern for evil and suffering. The atheist supposedly manipulates and exploits the suffering of others to condemn God and thus degrades those people. Heavy accusations indeed! Atheists are accused of caring about the notion of a loving God who reigns over all things completely more than about evil. This is a straw man approach. When we have to live in this universe we have to start with how repulsive evil is and its bad simply because it hurts and stuff any alleged plan of God's.

Make no mistake: the doctrine that we must believe in God though there is natural evil is at least implicitly but definitely accusing unbelievers of trying to debunk God's love and not caring about the evil at all though it will be used as an excuse for denying the existence of God. There is passive aggressive hatred in the doctrine.

Christian Assertion: God does not create the diseases and earthquakes miraculously so he is not directly responsible for any natural evil. He is not the direct but the indirect or the remote cause. God does not cause tragic deaths - he only refuses to do a miracle to prevent the death.

Answer: It's deliberate lies. The doctrine of creation says that each individual thing is a miracle made from nothing. Death is a miracle as much as its reverse would be.

Christian Assertion: God shows he hates natural evil by the fact that he inspires you to consider natural events however violent only to be evil if they actually hurt people. You will not say that a meteorite destroying the earth is a good thing if it gets rid of human beings so that animals may thrive better in our absence. A meteorite hitting a remote region and hurting nothing is good or perhaps just a neutral thing.

Reply: If God hates natural evil then he needs to look at the logic of doing something that he hates. It would not be happening if he really hated it.

God supposedly put us in this world to take good positive action against harmful and evil things and people.

The vast majority of people can do nothing about the meteorite. Science probably can do nothing either. Only a cruel God would ask you to consider natural evil by definition to refer to only what can hurt people or does hurt people as if you are supposed to do something about it when you cannot. Even the evils we can handle are few and far between. A God inspiring you to feel something natural is evil because it can harm people and because he wants to get you to do something when you cannot is a liar. Inspiring is communicating.

Christian Assertion: People may deliberately put themselves in danger or sometimes they just don't know any better. If they die in tsunamis or whatever that is not God's fault but down to the decisions they made. God's role is simply that he did no miracle to get them to move somewhere safer.

Reply: It is still being said to be their doing. That is still offensive and insulting.

William Lane Craig says that if man had looked after nature properly and did sensible things there would be no problem with nature. That answer insults the vast majority of the human race who died in natural disasters for they did not know. It was not their fault. Mistakes are made and God cannot use them as a justification. :People must be allowed to make mistakes and be responded to with compassion.

Christian Assertion: Natural evil is unavoidable for if God protected us from it all then we would have a new natural evil: the state of being spoiled selfish creatures.

Reply: Translation - you are a bad person so you will spoil. God might put you in a situation where your viciousness will not be obvious but it will not change you into a person with a properly good heart.

Do not fail to see how nasty that Christian assertion is and how it is full of hateful insinuation. See how it says we force God to permit natural evil! If it is so necessary then why not say he sends it directly either through nature or a hidden miracle? A God who permits natural evil but does not send it obviously is not interested in doing what is best for us. A healthy and able mother who endlessly permits somebody to feed her baby instead of doing it herself would be a bad mother. Christians say God is doing something similar and they still call him a good daddy!! Notice how the reply is devoid of real compassion and shows the true colours of the Christian and the God-believer.

Christian Assertion: Adam and Eve and others have sinned and sin brings hurt in itself and hurt as in other consequences. You hurt yourself by sinning at all and more hurt will come. Christians say that Adam and Eve because they are offenders that we are all connected to made us suffer their punishment though it is not our fault. It is surmised by some that Adam and Eve at the start had bodies like the body of Jesus after the resurrection which was unaffected by harm. If an avalanche fell on Jesus it would do him no harm for the rocks would just pass through him. Adam and Eve then sinned and we are told

their bodies changed. This is a resurrection in reverse! That aside, it is said that when Adam and Eve became independent of God they threw off his protection and that had consequences for them and their children.

Reply: The Bible says nothing of the sort about Adam and Eve. Jesus himself said nothing about what his resurrection body was like. The doctrines about the ghost style body are based on hearsay. It is not certain that even the New Testament supports it. A vision of a Jesus who appears in ghost like body does not mean Jesus has a ghost like body. Even in Catholicism, apparitions are done by different methods. It is thought by some that Mary did not appear bodily in Lourdes but was seen by remote viewing. The Bible believers always really believe in their own theories and speculations and interpretations rather than in the Bible.

And if Adam and Eve had a reverse resurrection then maybe it happened to the risen Jesus too!

Christian Assertion: Human sin in general causes and worsens natural evil. So if you suffer sin is to blame though not necessarily your own sin or sins. Jesus said that natural disasters in some cases had nothing to do with the particular sinners who died and were not down to their sins. See John 9:1-3. See Luke 13:4. But as sin is supposed to damage all around it the sins of others then have a role.

Reply: Jesus however clearly made the notion that suffering is down to sin an understandable view to take though he dismissed it. Atheists prefer to say there is no excuse for even considering it. And Jesus did not say that every disaster has nothing to do with your sins. He expressly said that punishment for sin through natural disaster does happen.

William Lane Craig was asked by Kevin Harris if natural evils could be seen not as direct or miraculous judgments of God but as indirect ones. Craig said he could not see any reason to think that. In other words, if a reason or an indication came up he would consider that dreadful doctrine or even believe it.

No decent person implies they would consider such hideous nonsense.

Surely Craig thinks natural evil is the indirect result or remote result of human moral evil? He says he does not. But if natural evil is fine then what is so wrong with saying it is a direct or indirect result? The Christians are trying to play on the common tendency to worry more about direct evil than indirect as if the latter could not be worse! It usually is worse and more deceptive.

Christian Assertion: Moral evil such as sin matters and natural evil is nothing in comparison.

Reply: This is a bare assertion. Why should we agree with that? Just because you can say that does not say you morally should say it! Why is it not a sin to say natural evil is fine and should happen? Sin makes no sense if it is not about avoiding harmful attitudes.

The naturalistic fallacy - getting a moral ought from an is or something that is not about morality is present here! Logic and observation cannot prove that if you stab somebody you did wrong. The reason is that logic is not a moral tool and neither is observation. They do different jobs from what morality seeks to do. We would need some firm criteria to work out moral oughts if we really care about the appalling suffering that happens in natural disasters.

It is shocking that the God belief implies that sin is the worst evil and that a small sin is worse than a natural disaster like an earthquake. God allows natural evil to happen implying he prefers it to sin. But God should abhor sin and evil the same. Evil whether wilful or not should offend him infinitely.

FINALLY - We are wilfully and unjustly blamed for the disaster that nature is. Don't forget that natural evil is everywhere all the time. It is not just this tsunami there or the earthquake here. We are always threatened by nature's seeming order

which is really not an order but a disorder that looks more ordered than it is. Nobody tells us if our free will to do harm is not just another natural evil. We are even accused of putting ourselves in the way of trouble by living in earthquake zones. We are told that the natural evil of getting spoiled matters more than the death and carnage of an earthquake where there are children's hospitals. This is a very serious subject and people believing in God and being led to God by religion that do not give them the in depth study they need on the subject is a disgrace.