

If somebody has a theory or doctrine and there is no way to show it is false or unlikely then it is clearly not just unscientific but anti-scientific. It is an ideology. It is about serving the idea not the truth.

The bigger the idea the bigger the problem.

And it does not get much bigger than God, creator of all and the infinite love.

God by definition is that which has the right to tell you what to do for he is your creator. As God is based on the assumption that he has the right to tell you what to do and condemn you it needs proving. Why? Because human dignity demands that no authority be accepted without proving its right to subject you to it. So not having proof shows there is no God. If God loves you and is fair he cannot and will not have it any other way. Having no proof has nothing to do with proving anything else false. God is different. Not being able to prove God proves there is no God. It also proves that regardless of there being a God or not, the way believers develop faith in him has ulterior manipulative motives. So even if there is a God faith in him would be a sin!

It is taught by the monotheistic religions that God has no duty to make us happy. They say God can be good without being about our happiness. But they have to admit that this makes it likely that he might not be good. You have a right to assume somebody who is not about your happiness is not about you. Religion orders you to think different about God and to accept him fully. God according to Jesus commanded that. That in itself is proof that God in fact has to be evil if he has really commanded such a thing!

So why does evil happen if there is a God?

Could evil be down to God's weakness or indifference or malice?

Or it could be that evil is evil because God condemns it and opposes so evil is not God's fault and he tries to stop it by condemning it and leaving it up to us to defy evil. God could condemn evil and still be evil if he makes us so that his condemning only makes us worse or keeps us sinning. Maybe we can go good but he educates us in a deliberately manipulative way to make it too hard for us.

God having good intentions is very unlikely when you look at the choices you have here. Life involves making well-meaning choices all the time that spell disaster for yourself and for others.

God is said to be incompatible with evil. So if you do evil you cannot get near him. That is not because he is rejecting you but because you are unable to unite with him. A God who can accept you but won't because of your sin is intending to oppose your sin. This version of God is not. This is not a moral God but something else. Water cannot fall on the sun but that does not mean the sun thinks its immoral or something! Its physics not ethics and God is turned into something akin to the sun!

Religion refuses to admit that any evil or harm refutes God. Thus they protect the concept from refutation. So God is non-falsifiable. But non-falsifiable is a waste of energy. It is not worth anything. Is it worth anything to say that dandelion leaves cure cancer and then make excuses for when it does not work? Where do you stop? Why cherry pick one non-falsifiable idea over another? To cherry-pick a non-falsifiable option and end up with God means your devotion is about you not God.

Note as well that God is about an acting being not just an idea or concept. The concept is about a being who is the sum of his actions and who has potential actions. Thus for Ann the idea of God is of one who makes the leaves cure. That is no minor thing about her belief. The cure is as serious of a subject as God himself. Those who make God non-falsifiable make it too simple. It is not just about a being existing or not. It is endlessly more complicated than that.

Is blaming God for evil and suffering or not blaming the most falsifiable?

First of all it matters. If statement a is falsifiable then you may as well deny a. The statement is useless and you are being manipulative by making it sound useful. If I believe in an irrefutable tooth fairy I may as well believe in an irrefutable anything at all. I should advocate that its up for grabs and I cannot tell anybody to believe my choice.

Second, while a claimed fact is either true or false, some statements are more immune to falsification than others. Suppose the New Testament said, "Jesus came back from the dead in private and nobody saw him rise or saw him. Nobody seen him since he was buried." That seems as bad as saying, "There is a God but God has hidden the evidence for his existence.

Nothing refutes God.” The latter is more immune to being shown wrong than the first. That is because you can

The more immune to falsification a theory or doctrine is the worse it is.

Which one is the worst in terms of trying to avoid what truth, reality and evidence say? The evidence that suspicious people claim such miracles can help show that Jesus probably did not rise. But the latter is beyond the reach of probability and evidence.

If it is claimed that God raised him then at a stroke one becomes as bad as the other. The two attitudes are unified.

Let us look at a scale.

#1 offender: stating that a being has hidden or prevented the evidence for its existence

#2 offender: no evidence but this is unintended by the being

See the difference? #1 means you can claim that Santa Claus is the president of the United States and is hiding that. There is no reality check and its dishonest to pick one invention and not another.

#2 can come up with explanations why this is the kind of being for whom there is no mark. You have to think. You are not being exploited or at risk of that.