

**There is no argument that a perfectly good God and evil are reconcilable - there is only a guess disguised as an argument**

*What is a circular argument? Why it is not an argument.*

A circular argument is a guess disguised as an argument. It is about putting what you want to believe before the truth.

*Does evil contradict the existence of a loving God?*

Religion argues:

God is all-good and all-powerful and nothing exists without his consent.

Evil exists.

Both are true so somehow one does not disprove the other.

Notice how no evidence is given that God can let evil happen and remain as good as ever.

It is an evidence question not a theory question. Even if the argument is logically valid it may still be untrue.

Logical validity is not enough in this case. It is illogical to leave evidence out for it is evidence that tells you what good and what evil is.

The argument is invalid because it is missing a premise - it needs not to define evil but to let evil be defined by evidence. There is no premise defining evil correctly.

*The circular argument based on assuming all evil fits*

If God and evil can fit together:

Then God can be partly evil. Religion assumes God can make a creation that goes bad but he cannot let himself go bad in any respect. This is another assumption. If evil is allowed to happen does it matter where it is allowed to happen - within God or out?

Or is the answer that evil can exist despite him?

But that is saying God and evil are competitive! That is ludicrous when all that is made is from God. There is no competition.

Suppose evil can agree with the existence of God.

It does not follow that all kinds of evil agree. It does not follow that some of the evil that exists in the world can be tolerated by a truly good God.

The circle in the argument is in how it defines evil as that which always is good enough to be tolerable when in fact that is not necessarily true.

Not only do we have a circle but a logical error. What is not necessarily true is defined as necessarily true.

*It is an assumption not an opinion that evil fits God*

The opinion that they fit is better than an assumption for even an opinion tries to be based on the facts. But you cannot opine but only assume. Many have found that it is perception that tells you that a caused b. But it is not really telling you anything. It is only telling you how it looks. If you cannot really be totally sure that the acorn gives rise to the oak then how can you say that evil leads to good? Not all assumptions and opinions can be equal. In fact it is better to assume that acorns can lead to oaks than to assume that evil will produce good. Such a doctrine is even calling evil a mere side-effect of good. To say evil leads to good is just condoning it and God's role in it.

*Objection*

Believers say, "If God is absolute goodness then evil should be more evil than it would be if there were no God." This argument is wrong. If evil is evil then that is down to it and nothing else. It is not down to God or human opinion. It is what it is. If evil needs God so that it can be evil then how evil is it really? This contradiction shows that there is something amiss in the idea that evil and God can co-exist.

### *Believers turn good into a word*

Something is good in itself and good in how it affects something. That is two separate ways of being good.

Something is evil in itself and evil in how it affects something. That is two separate ways of being evil.

Believers deny the second for they say all things are good and evil is a falling short of how good they could be. But if there is no inherent evil then what sense does it make to talk about inherent good? If all is inherently good then there is no evil at all and it must be an illusion.

### *The argument that God uses evil actually depends on evil*

The idea of a purpose for your suffering means that God helps you through others. He is the reason the nurse is helping you. But that accuses many of not helping and not co-operating with God. It is bad to accuse people of neglect if it is untrue but it is terrible to say that people are blocking God from turning this earth into a paradise. It makes each person a conduit for all the evil that comes into the world. How could you love or respect anybody with such a belief? To argue that an all-good God can let evil happen is to argue in circles for you have, "This argument accuses people badly but it is necessary to believe in an all-good God and that makes it right for it is not that bad to accuse people so seriously."

### *Love*

Love is used as an excuse for evil happening.

Is love good in itself or good because of what it results in? Both? Logically if love is not good in itself then it cannot result in good. You don't want to argue that hate and evil are good if they could be followed by good. If love is not good in itself then the good results are not results but luck.

Does that mean love is intrinsically good just because it does something for me or gives me a loving heart to help others? Think about that.

To generate love in your heart in spite of the object of love is better than to love because of the object of your love. In other words, let us ask if to love God or anybody in spite of what you think of him is maximum nobility?

### *Circular arguments about letting evil happen as opposed to causing it to happen*

There is a difference in doing evil or letting it happen so that some worthwhile good may come and removing an evil such as cancer. But there are lessons to be learned:

One may look for a good purpose as a result of the evil.

Or alternatively one may look for a good purpose that will happen anyway for it is luck that produces good not evil.

Or you may only look for the good in removing an evil.

Or you may look

If good is stronger than evil then it follows that any good at all makes an evil worthwhile

This conclusion is so outrageous that nobody accepts it. Oddly many have no problem though with saying God makes and designs hideous diseases.

It is proof that there is something circular in arguing that an all-good God can put up with evil.

If evil cannot it a loving god then it is not fine. to say that evil is fine if nothing is doing it or if the explanation is that we are making evil of our own free will is saying, "No matter what I refuse to see evil as not fitting god." It is odd to blame human nature for creating evil and then to ignore evil that is not down to human evil. Even if in theory you could say no evil is enough to refute God you cannot know all about every evil and you need to know before you can speak. Evil is too serious for it to be any other way and evil calls for revulsion and opposition.

## *Doctrine of God forces a bias on you*

God by definition is that which alone matters or is inherently good. Therefore if evil is a challenge it is your duty even if you don't understand it to define evil as that which is logically compatible with God. Thus the doctrine of God forbids you to try and see if evil refutes God. The doctrine does not care if you are refusing to see evil as what it is should it contradict the love of God. Thus if God needs you to do that then he is not inherently good after all! The doctrine of God pressures believers to redefine evil. Evil is not anybody's possession to redefine for it is what it is.

## *May be compatible*

For people who say evil is a mystery and full of dark horses to say it fits God is arrogance. It is something only God can say but that gives no human being the right to say it.

If evil is compatible with God then

Is it just compatible?

Or does it depend?

Some believe that when evil happens in one event it happens because some event connected to it causally is perfecting. So this is a balancing scales job.

It cannot be logically proven that it may be compatible never mind that it IS compatible.

## *Hope*

The notion that evil will come to a good end claims to offer hope. A horror is still a horror no matter what is at the end. Christians then certainly are focusing more on hope than the good purpose. It is the hope that is offered for the good purpose will come whether you hope or not or believe or not. The implication is you should aim to hope a lot. A little hope means you will be virtually as badly off as one who has no hope.

Arguments that God fits evil and evil fits God are really about wanting to hope. But feeling you need hope does nothing to suggest that

## *The mystery approach*

It is claimed by some that the advantage of saying evil is a mystery is in declaring that it does not contradict the justice of God nor does it blame evil all on human free will. Evil must come from somebody's will though. If so then what are we calling evil a mystery for?

The mystery is proclaimed where there is no mystery for mystery helps create shadows and disguises and misdirection.

## *God is assumed before religion decides what evil is*

Religion may use the word evil but what it actually means by the word is absorbed evil.

The idea of absorbed evil refers to how good comes from evil. The evil becomes a good. Absorbed evil is said to be the answer as to why a good God can allow evil. Absorbed evil already assumes that God exists because you are assuming not only that it leads to good but it leads to the supreme good which is God.

Should evil be defined as that which nothing all has the right to allow to happen?

Should it be defined as that which a God could allow for a purpose?

Does it matter?

If we go with the first then it means we have to be God for others if there is no God. We have to do what a God should do.

If we go with the second

That's not selfish. Remember that the opposite of selfish is not selfless but doormat. And in my experience doormats have a nasty habit of not only giving away their own rights but those of other people, too.

Religion looks at evil and just assumes it fits God and then argues that it fits God. That is no way to think about things. It

shows no concern for what is true or false but for believing what you want to believe. The evil fitting God attempt is made more important than God in the sense that it suggests that whether there is a God or not good is stronger. You have to KNOW an evil before you can say it fits God. That is not possible. Knowing it means experiencing it and being in its habitat.

The problem of evil argument is actually invalid unless creation, making something but not using anything to make it from, is one of the premises.

1 Nothing is the absence of anything. Nothing is the absence of anything and it therefore has no properties at all where it can become something. It is logically impossible for something to come from nothing for as Parmenides said, "Out of nothing nothing comes." This statement is true by definition.

2 Nothing then has no power to create and no power to allow creation.

3 Thus whatever exists comes from God.

4 God is good therefore evil is just good that is not up to standard and is not a thing any more than the absence of air is a thing.

5 Therefore evil can fit God if the reason for tolerating evil is good enough.

Premise 3 does not follow from 2. If nothing comes from nothing any more than 1 can come from 0 then even God can't do anything about it. Premise 3 contradicts 2.

Creation is an assumption. It is also a contradiction.

Therefore any argument that evil fits God is based on assuming creation is true and we need proof that it can be true and is true. The problem of evil is solved only by begging the question and that is not a solution at all! The problem of evil fails for it embraces evil lies. It is evil to mess about with something as serious as evil.

The problem of evil fails because it depends on a lie and tricks with logic to reach a "solution." The other lie is in how the argument to make evil look like it fits God is put forward when in fact it is no good unless it starts with creation and God being creator.

### *Purpose*

Religion says that if there is no God then we end up with no explanation for why good is good or even matters. They say that is more important than any problem of evil.

The argument is,

1 If God does not exist, then the universe has no purpose and everything is just here by chance and accident.

2 If the universe is empty of purpose then objective moral values such as love and truthfulness and justice and mercy do not matter.

3 That tells us that if God does not exist, then objective moral values do not exist either.

4 These values do exist

5 Therefore there is a God.

The error is that purpose can be replicated. A functional purpose is not the same as a real purpose. A person absentmindedly locking the door is an example of the former. It is really no different from what a machine is doing for the brain is acting like a machine in this case. A person doing it with full awareness is an example of the latter.

It is more important to have functional purpose for that is the one essential. Thus objective moral values matter more if the purpose is functional than they would if it were intentional.

### *Conclusion*

The problem of evil leads to a tautology. It is said that those who say that psychological egoism is true are guilty of assuming what they are trying to prove and claiming to have as good as proved it. The reason this is said is that they have an answer for all the evidence for altruism. But God and the problem of evil lead to the same nonsense.

